

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, June 11, 1985

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Give us renewed awareness, O God, of the power of words of faith brought together with good works. Forgive us when we offer only pious thoughts and empty phrases and neglect the will to act in the interest of justice. May our faith become active in love and may our words and deeds glorify You and serve our neighbors both in our communities and throughout the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 254, nays 145, answered "present" 3, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 147]

YEAS—254

Ackerman	Boner (TN)	Coyne
Addabbo	Bonior (MI)	Crockett
Alexander	Bonker	Daniel
Anderson	Borski	Darden
Andrews	Bosco	Daschle
Annunzio	Boucher	Davis
Anthony	Boxer	de la Garza
Archer	Breaux	Dellums
Aspin	Brooks	Dicks
Atkins	Broomfield	Dingell
AuCoin	Brown (CA)	Dixon
Barnard	Bruce	Donnelly
Barnes	Bryant	Dorgan (ND)
Bateman	Burton (CA)	Downey
Bates	Bustamante	Duncan
Bedell	Byron	Dwyer
Beilenson	Carper	Dyson
Bennett	Carr	Early
Berman	Chappell	Eckart (OH)
Bevill	Coelho	Edgar
Biaggi	Coleman (TX)	Edwards (CA)
Boggs	Collins	English
Boland	Cooper	Erdreich

Evans (IL)	Levin (MI)	Rodino
Fascell	Levine (CA)	Roe
Fazio	Lipinski	Rogers
Feighan	Lloyd	Rose
Fish	Long	Rostenkowski
Flippo	Lowry (WA)	Roukema
Florio	Luken	Rowland (CT)
Foglietta	Lundine	Rowland (GA)
Foley	MacKay	Roybal
Ford (TN)	Markey	Rudd
Fowler	Marlenee	Russo
Frank	Martinez	Savage
Frost	Matsui	Scheuer
Fuqua	Mavroules	Schneider
Garcia	Mazzoli	Schumer
Gaydos	McCloskey	Sharp
Gejdenson	McCollum	Shelby
Gephardt	McCurdy	Sisisky
Glickman	McHugh	Skellton
Gonzalez	McKinney	Slattery
Gordon	McMillan	Smith (FL)
Gradison	Meyers	Smith (IA)
Gray (IL)	Mica	Smith (NE)
Gray (PA)	Mikulski	Smith (NJ)
Green	Miller (CA)	Spratt
Guarini	Mineta	St Germain
Hall (OH)	Mollohan	Stallings
Hall, Ralph	Montgomery	Stark
Hamilton	Moody	Stokes
Hatcher	Moore	Stratton
Hayes	Morrison (CT)	Swift
Hefner	Mrazek	Tauzin
Hertel	Murphy	Thomas (GA)
Holt	Murtha	Torres
Hopkins	Myers	Torricelli
Horton	Natcher	Towns
Howard	Neal	Traffant
Hoyer	Nelson	Traxler
Hubbard	Nichols	Udall
Huckaby	Nowak	Valentine
Hughes	O'Brien	Vander Jagt
Hutto	Oakar	Vento
Jeffords	Oberstar	Visclosky
Jenkins	Obey	Volkmer
Johnson	Olin	Walgren
Jones (NC)	Ortiz	Watkins
Jones (OK)	Panetta	Waxman
Jones (TN)	Pease	Weiss
Kanjorski	Pepper	Wheat
Kaptur	Perkins	Whitley
Kastenmeier	Petri	Whitten
Kennelly	Pickle	Wirth
Kildee	Price	Wise
Klecza	Pursell	Wolpe
Kolter	Rahall	Wortley
Kostmayer	Rangel	Wright
LaFalce	Ray	Wyden
Lantos	Regula	Wyllie
Leath (TX)	Reid	Yates
Lehman (CA)	Richardson	Yatron
Lehman (FL)	Rinaldo	Young (MO)
Leland	Robinson	

NAYS—145

Armey	Coble	Fiedler
Badham	Combest	Frenzel
Bartlett	Conte	Gallo
Barton	Coughlin	Gekas
Bentley	Courter	Gilman
Bereuter	Craig	Goodling
Billirakis	Crane	Gregg
Bliley	Dannemeyer	Grothberg
Boehlert	Daub	Gunderson
Boulter	DeLay	Hammerschmidt
Brown (CO)	Derrick	Hansen
Burton (IN)	Dickinson	Hartnett
Callahan	DioGuardi	Hendon
Campbell	Dornan (CA)	Henry
Carney	Dreier	Hill
Chandler	Durbin	Hillis
Chapple	Eckert (NY)	Hunter
Cheney	Edwards (OK)	Hyde
Clay	Emerson	Ireland
Coats	Evans (IA)	Jacobs
Cobey	Fawell	Kasich

Kindness	Mitchell	Siljander
Kolbe	Molinari	Skeen
Kramer	Monson	Slaughter
Lagomarsino	Moorhead	Smith (NH)
Latta	Morrison (WA)	Smith, Denny
Leach (IA)	Nielson	Smith, Robert
Lent	Oxley	Snowe
Lewis (CA)	Packard	Solomon
Lewis (FL)	Parris	Spence
Lightfoot	Pashayan	Stangeland
Livingston	Penny	Stenholm
Loeffler	Porter	Strang
Lott	Quillen	Stump
Lowery (CA)	Ridge	Sundquist
Lujan	Ritter	Swindall
Lunnen	Roberts	Tauke
Mack	Roemer	Taylor
Madigan	Roth	Thomas (CA)
Martin (IL)	Saxton	Vucanovich
Martin (NY)	Schaefer	Walker
McCaIn	Schroeder	Weber
McCandless	Schuette	Whitehurst
McDade	Schulze	Wolf
McGrath	Sensenbrenner	Young (AK)
McKernan	Shaw	Young (FL)
Michel	Shumway	Zachau
Miller (OH)	Shuster	
Miller (WA)	Sikorski	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Dymally	Solarz	Synar
---------	--------	-------

NOT VOTING—31

Akaka	Gibbons	Snyder
Applegate	Gingrich	Staggers
Broyhill	Hawkins	Studds
Clinger	Heftel	Sweeney
Coleman (MO)	Kemp	Tallon
Conyers	Manton	Weaver
DeWine	McEwen	Whittaker
Dowdy	Moakley	Williams
Fields	Owens	Wilson
Ford (MI)	Sabo	
Franklin	Seiberling	

□ 1220

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1043. An act to authorize appropriations for the Department of Energy for national security programs for fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes;

S. 1080. An act to amend the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970 to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes; and

S. 1141. An act relating to certain telephone services for Senators.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 99, AMERICAN CONSERVATION CORPS ACT OF 1985

Mr. HALL of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-166) on the resolution (H. Res. 195) providing for

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

the consideration of the bill (H.R. 99) to provide for the conservation, rehabilitation, and improvement of natural and cultural resources located on public or Indian lands, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1409, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1986

Mr. HALL of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-167) on the resolution (H. Res. 196) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1409) to authorize certain construction at military installations for fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS TO SIT ON TOMORROW DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs be permitted to sit during proceedings under the 5-minute rule on tomorrow, Wednesday, June 12, 1985.

Mr. Speaker, this has been cleared by the minority.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, we have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON AVIATION AND SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION TO SIT ON TOMORROW DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. YOUNG of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Aviation and the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation be permitted to sit during the 5-minute rule in the House on tomorrow, Wednesday, June 12, 1985.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, the minority has no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO SIT TODAY DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during the 5-minute rule on today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin whether or not this request has been cleared by the minority. It is my understanding that we were not aware of the request on this side.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I must in all candor tell the gentleman that it has not.

Mr. WALKER. Then I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is aware of the fact that it takes 10 Members to object.

Messrs. FAWELL, LOTT, MICHEL, HANSEN, LIGHTFOOT, ROWLAND of Connecticut, PACKARD, NIELSON, of Utah, and COBLE also objected.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

A TRIBUTE TO KAREEM ABDUL-JABBAR AND THE LAKERS—AND THE CELTICS TOO—FOR A GREAT BASKETBALL SERIES

(Mr. DIXON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today and pay tribute to an outstanding group of athletes who through their relentless determination and unyielding spirit have for the third time in the past six seasons brought the National Basketball Association's championship trophy home to the city of Los Angeles.

My congratulations to the 1985 Laker players, their coaches and management who, once and for all, cleaned out a closet of Celtic skeletons. They provided fans with an exciting brand of basketball that featured a break faster than the Concorde, a patented sky hook that seems only to get better with each passing year, and outside shooting that would make a SWAT team jealous.

The Los Angeles Lakers are a first-class organization. Their captain is a man who exemplified competitiveness in every sense of the word. Kareem Abdul-Jabbar has enabled fans in Los Angeles to celebrate many championships, both as a Laker and as a UCLA Bruin. This season in particular, Kareem, who is in the twilight of an awesome career, played with an intensity and skill that many young players

wish they could duplicate. He was awarded the most valuable player trophy of the championship series, and many would agree that that Kareem is the most valuable player of the decade.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we should truly thank the Lakers and the Boston Celtics for providing basketball fans around the world quality basketball and a great championship series.

□ 1230

TRIBUTE TO BILLY LASTER FISH

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express a great sense of loss upon the death of a dear friend to many of us in this Chamber.

We had come to know Billy Laster Fish through her charm, her sincerity, and through the constant support she offered to her husband, our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. Fish].

Billy was always active in political life, sharing in her husband's duties. She was a household word in the 21st District of New York, where all who met her came to appreciate her charm and graciousness.

Billy Fish attended the Southwest Texas State University prior to becoming a devoted mother. I remember how proud HAM was when she completed her education by graduating cum laude from American University in 1979.

Billy was a determined woman who never allowed adversity to get her down. During the last year, despite her illness and confinement, she always had a kind word for everyone.

Washington, DC, will never be the same without her.

To our colleague HAM, and to Billy and HAM's children, James, John, Ham, Nicholas, Peter, and Julia, I know you join with me in extending our sincerest condolences.

It was indicative of Billy's concern that it was her wish that in her memory we support the United Negro College Fund.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to join with the gentleman in expressing our sympathies to our colleague, HAM FISH.

My wife, Nancy, and I knew Billy Fish very, very well. She was a person of great courage, a great person, very friendly. It is a great loss to us personally to have her gone.

I want to join with the gentleman in expressing our sympathies and regrets

to the HAM FISH family and particularly to our colleague, HAM FISH.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the leader of our New York Republican Congressional Delegation [Mr. HORTON] for his kind words.

Mr. DiOGUARDI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DiOGUARDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to join the distinguished gentleman from New York in expressing our great sense of loss upon the death of Billy Fish.

The constant support she offered her husband, HAM, was evident to me even as a new Congressman. Just a few weeks ago I was privileged to sit next to Billy at a Women's Leadership Conference that she held with HAM in Washington, for the women of the 21st District of New York. Her support and interest was clearly evident and appreciated by all.

Mr. Speaker, we will all miss her. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his supportive words.

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to join him and my colleagues in paying tribute to Billy Fish. She was a person not only devoted to her husband and our friend and colleague, HAMILTON FISH, but a thoroughly decent person, committed to some very important issues, including the limitation of the nuclear arms race.

Mr. Speaker, we will miss her very, very much, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York.

I am pleased to yield to our minority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for taking this time so that we might comment briefly on the passing of Billy Fish, the wife of our colleague HAM FISH of New York. After she had suffered her first stroke and was confined to a wheelchair, my wife was very privileged to take her to a number of functions in which she still wanted to participate. She was a delight to be with. Always optimistic about life and her progress toward rehabilitation.

It came as a severe shock to us when we heard that Billy had suffered a second and fatal stroke 2 weeks ago.

We are always going to remember with what courage she faced her particular problem and the inspiration she gave each and every one of us when we were in her presence.

My wife Connie would surely want to join me in expressing our profound

sympathy to all the members of the family in their great loss. We share the family's grievous loss.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] for his kind words.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GILMAN. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks.

My wife, Nancy, and I have been privileged to know Billy Fish for these some 10 years that I have served in Congress. She was just a marvelous lady. She was generous, very, very friendly, charming and a very devoted wife to our colleague, HAMILTON FISH.

We are going to miss Billy Fish. She was a great lady.

I thank the gentleman for taking out this special time to focus attention upon our great loss of Billy Fish. Our sympathies go out to HAMILTON and to his family on this loss.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his supportive words.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to our distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO].

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wish to associate myself with this tribute of praise and this eulogy to a fine lady, one whom I was privileged to know.

Billy Fish was truly a rare individual—she combined charm with a courage that was remarkable—this was so apparent during the period of her illness. Never did she lose her sense of humor even while she herself was heavily burdened within: Billy Fish felt a deep commitment to noble causes—to the advancement of the underprivileged, to the realization of a universe free of the fear of nuclear holocaust, to a world at peace.

Billy Fish was a caring person and she touched all who knew her with this fine quality. She was a dear friend for whom I had a deep affection and whom I respected and admired. My dear friend HAMILTON FISH, has suffered a great loss but I am sure that he will find some comfort in knowing that so many share his sorrow with him.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary for his kind words and, Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair for permitting us to make these remarks at this time.

CONGRATULATIONS TO WORLD CHAMPION LOS ANGELES LAKERS

(Mr. LEVINE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate history's greatest basketball team: the Los Angeles Lakers. None of us should be surprised by the Lakers' latest triumph, which was their third championship series victory in 6 years.

Granted, the Lakers had accommodated the Celtics eight previous times in championship play, but this year there was a little extra Magic in the air. With the quickest hands in the game and that infectious spirit, one might say that Magic was everywhere in this series. Kareem once again inspired us with his talent and dominance and proved that hustle is a function of determination and not age. Rambis and Kupchak shattered the notion that you have to grow up on the streets of Boston to learn how to hit the boards. Worthy and Coop thrilled us with their usual acrobatics and shooting consistency, reminding us all that it's always showtime when the Lakers take the court.

No team has brought as much style and excitement to professional basketball as the Lakers. This series was just the latest glimpse at the team's amazing grace. Our mind's eye still pictures Mr. Clutch's quick release, Elgin's midair suspended body, Wilt's finger role, and Egan's alley-oop.

Laker basketball taught us about the possibilities of man's strength, endurance, and agility. With the assistance of Chick Hearn's commentary taking us left to right across our radio dials, it seems that we have run with the Lakers forever. Now, we pause for one sweet moment to say thank you.

JUDY HARVEY, AN EXAMPLE OF COURAGE

(Mr. STRANG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, this last Saturday, at my town meeting in Pagosa Springs, CO, I met a very brave lady, Judy Harvey, the mother of Chris Harvey, one of the more than 1 million missing children in this country. Chris disappeared from their summer home in Pagosa Springs on July 11, 1984. Chris Harvey is 15 years old, 5 foot 11 inches tall, and weighs approximately 135 pounds. His hair is light brown and his eyes are hazel.

For the sake of Judy and Jim Harvey—any persons having information about Chris Harvey should call the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children at 1-800-843-5678.

That's 1-800-843-5678. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you Judy Harvey for the example of courage you give me and others whose lives you touch.

OPPOSE AID TO THE CONTRAS

(Mrs. KENNELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to oppose aid to the Contras in Nicaragua.

In the last few weeks, we have come to focus on the wrong issue. The issue is not Mr. Ortega—not his travel plans, not his tailoring, not even the words we would like to hear him say.

The issue is what policy will achieve our goals in Nicaragua? And here the answer is that more aid to the Contras just won't work. We cannot encourage peace and democracy in Nicaragua by pumping money into efforts to overthrow their government.

We can't encourage stability by promoting war and upheaval.

We can't promote democracy by pushing Nicaragua further toward Moscow.

We can't achieve peace by supporting military overthrow. What would our country do in that situation? What would any country do?

Mr. Speaker, I believe that our policy toward Nicaragua poses moral issues. But it also poses commonsense ones. Voting against Contra aid this week is more than a chance to demonstrate our good intentions to the American people and the world. It is a chance to demonstrate our good sense. I urge this House once again to defeat aid to the Contras.

□ 1240

CONFEREES: A NEW IMPERATIVE TO CUT THE DEFICIT

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday OMB projected the fiscal year 1986 deficit will be \$17 to \$20 billion more than originally forecast. This means that one-third of the savings contained in the House and Senate versions of the budget resolution has already evaporated. By 1988, the deficit will be in the \$175-\$195 billion range, rather than the \$100 billion we have targeted.

This is fiscal child abuse. Never in American history has one generation left such an immense burden of debt for its children to repay.

Today, I am writing all the House and Senate conferees to ask them to produce a conference report that takes these new projections into account, and makes even greater savings than were contained in either our resolu-

tion or the Senate's. I suggest they take the lower figure of the House and Senate resolution in each budget category.

The moment of budget truth is upon us. Will the conferees cut a deal and send still another bill drenched with red ink to our children? If so, I, for one, will oppose the conference report in the strongest possible terms.

TRUE HUMANITARIAN AID AND THE MICHEL AMENDMENT

(Mr. DURBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, humanitarian assistance will get a bad name if we pass the Michel amendment to the supplemental appropriation bill.

Historically humanitarian assistance from our country has been given to help end suffering, regardless of whether the recipients were our political allies or not. Our recent efforts to end the famine in Marxist Ethiopia is a good example of real humanitarian assistance. But with the Michel amendment this administration has distorted the term humanitarian so that in Nicaragua we only extend a helping hand to those who agree with us politically and then only to military forces.

Let us call the Michel amendment for what it is. The United States is sending assistance to a military force attempting to overthrow the Government of Nicaragua. With these millions of dollars we will only increase the suffering of ordinary Nicaraguans.

The administration insists that the American people support its goal of overthrowing the Government of Nicaragua. If this is true, why must the President cloak his real intentions in the guise of humanitarian assistance?

The administration's policy in Nicaragua deprives us of our most compelling weapon in the family of nations: adherence to the rule of law and to the rule of reason.

A humanitarian vote is "no" on the Michel amendment.

THE HONORABLE MELVIN PRICE RECEIVES THE VANGUARD AWARD

(Mrs. HOLT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues a most distinguished and important award that our friend and colleague MEL PRICE, chairman emeritus of the Armed Services Committee is to receive tomorrow from the Non-Commissioned Officers Association of the United States of America.

This award is the Vanguard Award. It has only been presented to two

other Members of the House. It is being presented to the chairman emeritus in recognition of his more than 30 years dedicated service and of our Nation's defense needs and more importantly his willingness to fight for the quality of life for our military personnel.

This award is being presented to Chairman MEL PRICE at a luncheon tomorrow in the Rayburn Building.

U.S. POLICY IN NICARAGUA

(Mr. MARLENEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, it has become clear that the cabal of fearmongering from the liberal left is mounting a clarion call to all who would support an encampment of communists on this continent.

The call goes like this: "U.S. On Verge Of Jungle War," "Policies Of Aid Could Lead To War," and "Direct Confrontation With Soviet Union Likely."

These calls sound like a bird who has been reduced to shrill squawks because of eating fermented berries.

Could it be that their misinformation comes from the same source referred to in one of Washington's major newspapers—the Times—in a June 7 article I enclose that is headlined "Memo Provided Ortega Tips On Manipulating Hill Visitors."

U.S. foreign policy should be made in Washington, not in Central America and not in Managua.

MEMO PROVIDED ORTEGA TIPS ON MANIPULATING HILL VISITORS

(By Roger Fontaine and Ron Cordray)

A newly discovered Nicaraguan government memorandum sets out in revealing detail how the Sandinista government planned to manipulate three U.S. congressmen during their visit to Managua in early 1982 at a critical moment in the Reagan administration's efforts to win support for its policies in Central America.

The six-page, single-spaced memo—written to Daniel Ortega by Rita Delia Casco of the Ministry's North American Department—outlines "Approaches, observations, and suggestions with the purpose of taking maximum advantage of this delegation's visit."

The memo was dated Jan. 5, 1982.

The three congressmen, all liberal Democrats, were Sen. Christopher Dodd of Connecticut and Reps. Michael Barnes of Maryland and George Miller of California.

A copy of the memorandum was obtained by The Washington Times from the council on Inter-American Security, a Washington-based research firm that specializes in Latin American policy questions.

A spokesman for Sen. Dodd said he "obviously did not know of the memo" and that the senator had "no control over what was written regarding the visit."

The spokesman, however, cited a State Department interoffice cable that said the congressmen's visit "had a positive impact

vis-a-vis U.S. interests." The State Department cable said the congressmen "had a clear understanding of the current situation in Nicaragua and were under no illusions as to the true nature and trend of the Sandinista revolution."

An aide to Mr. Miller said the congressman was not aware of the memorandum, and that its contents represent "one person's opinion" and it "sounds very subjective." The aide said that if the Casco memo "means that Rep. Miller fought the attempt to fund the Contras, she's accurate."

Noting that Mr. Miller has visited Central America on three occasions, his aide said: "The situation [since the memo was written] has changed. It might have applied then, I'm not sure it would today."

Rep. Barnes could not be reached for comment.

The disclosure of the memo came as Congress prepared to vote once more on a Reagan administration proposal to offer humanitarian aid to the resistance forces fighting against the Sandinista government.

Rep. William Broomfield of Michigan, ranking minority on the House Foreign Relations Committee, said the Sandinista government's description of the three congressmen as "friends of the revolution" is a matter they "have to address . . . themselves."

Mr. Broomfield said he expected the administration's proposal for humanitarian aid to the resistance would carry on Tuesday. "A lot of members [who voted against the aid earlier] are getting a little itchy about the military buildup in Nicaragua, supplied by the Soviet Union, and Mr. Ortega's visit to Moscow immediately after the last vote."

State Department officials said the Nicaraguan Foreign Ministry memo came to U.S. attention about a month ago, and the State Department believes it to be authentic. One official said, however, that there was "no way to prove it."

The memo suggests the three lawmakers were singled out for attention because of their record of opposition to the Reagan administration and their influence in Congress.

"Congressman Barnes as well as Sen. Dodd have questioned and continue to question seriously, firmly, and insistently, the policy of the administration in respect to Central America in general, and El Salvador and Nicaragua in particular," the memorandum said.

"On many occasions the questioning of Barnes and Dodd have made [Alexander] Haig, [Thomas] Enders and other high officials at the Department of State to lose face in Congress."

"... [T]hese congressmen do not represent nor support the present policy of the Reagan administration toward Nicaragua; on the contrary, they question it, and are disposed to do everything possible to change it or at least to obstruct it."

The Sandinistas listed Rep. Barnes, chairman of the House Foreign Relations subcommittee on Western Hemisphere affairs, as the most important of the three, with "a very special power and influence somewhat disproportionate to any other congressman."

To back this assertion, the memo described Mr. Barnes as being actively courted by the Reagan administration.

"[Mr.] Enders, [then assistant secretary of state for Latin American affairs] is doing everything possible and impossible to gain [Mr. Barnes'] support, keeping him in-

formed in his way and calling him nearly every day," it said.

"Because of all of this, special care ought to be taken in cultivating his friendship," the Nicaraguan Foreign Ministry told Mr. Ortega.

As an example of such cultivation, the memo recommends that if jailed leaders of the Nicaraguan business community were to be released before their sentences were served, that Rep. Barnes be told of it, but "be asked to keep it secret; this will make him feel that he enjoys our confidence."

In another section of the memorandum, Miss Casco, the author, says of Rep. Miller: "I can say that he is more progressive than Dodd and Barnes and also wants to help us." She offered no suggestion of how Rep. Miller could be useful to the revolution.

All three legislators, the memo noted, "have serious suspicions" about CIA involvement in Nicaragua, but advised Mr. Ortega not to emphasize the U.S. intelligence angle "because we might run the risk of placing them on the defensive."

"More important and even more effective is presenting proof, data, and concrete information and let them draw their own conclusions," it said.

The memo repeatedly cautions the Sandinista leadership to be careful in presenting the Nicaraguan case to the U.S. legislators to mold opinion but not "impose" Managua's views on the Americans.

The author of the memo was not so cautious about suggestions for getting sensitive information from the delegation. It recommended that Mr. Ortega, addressed as "comrade commandant of the revolution," ask the congressional delegation "if they have any information that would demonstrate that the administration has discarded the possibility of a military action against Nicaragua or on a possible participation of the CIA in the activities of the Somocistas [the Sandinista term for the Nicaraguan resistance]."

The memo suggests that "Congress investigate the connection between the Florida training camps and those of Honduras" in reference to Nicaraguan resistance activities, and that Congress bring pressure to dismantle the camps.

The Foreign Ministry seemed concerned over explaining the possible appearance of MiG aircraft in Nicaragua. In terms that clearly demonstrate the ministry's ignorance of the Sandinista leadership's intentions on this matter, the memo outlines two possible approaches to be used with the congressional delegation.

Recommending that Mr. Ortega be "the most honest possible with them," the memo writer urged that, if the government intended to acquire the MiGs within six or eight weeks following the visits, Mr. Ortega should not lie to the congressional delegation for fear of losing credibility.

If the MiGs were, in fact, to be brought to Nicaragua, "it is suggested that we try to explain why we need them."

The memo outlines in great detail defensive arguments on a variety of sensitive subjects such as the militarization of Nicaragua, freedom of the press, the viability of the private sector, and pluralism.

The memo suggested that, to defend Nicaragua's growing military strength, Mr. Ortega tell the visitors of "(a) activities of the armed Somocista bands, (b) pacts between the militias of Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala with the possible help of the United States."

Within two months of his return from Managua, Rep. Barnes—long a foe of the

Reagan policy in Central America—introduced a bill to prevent the Reagan administration from assisting any clandestine operations against the Sandinistas.

In an essay written for *The Christian Science Monitor* shortly after the trip, Mr. Barnes repeated a number of themes presented in the Foreign Ministry memo.

In the *Monitor* article, Mr. Barnes said he took the trip at the urging of the Nicaraguan Embassy, and did so because of "the inability of the Reagan administration to see that its own actions are making the situation worse."

Rep. Barnes wrote that El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras, all sworn enemies of the Sandinista regime, were vastly increasing their military forces, and said that Nicaraguan exiles were operating against Nicaragua from Honduras with foreign support.

AID TO THE CONTRAS

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important we have a little straight talk about what is going on before we start voting on the Contra aid. We are going to hear all sorts of things about the travel of Ortega and other rhetoric.

But I want to point out to my colleagues that we have visiting in this city right now Prime Minister Gandhi from India. Why aren't people questioning Prime Minister Gandhi's positions? He just finished a trip to Russia and he certainly made out a whole lot better in aid commitments from the Russians than Daniel Ortega did.

If you also look at India's voting record in the U.N., you will find that they have aligned themselves with the Soviet Union over and over.

But the most amazing thing is to read Gandhi's interviews in the newspapers where he is consistently saying the Russians did not invade Afghanistan, they were invited in. And yet the White House is feeding and feting him and pretending like he is our wonderful ally.

Why is there a difference there?

Let us also ask President Reagan about his Mozambique policy. They are going to send trade missions to Marxist Mozambique. That's the reverse of the treatment Nicaragua is getting. It's impossible not to see all sorts of hypocrisy here.

The issue is what is best for the United States and it seems to me the best thing we can do is listen to the Contadora nations who are trying to do everything they can to bring us to the table, to bring reason rather than violence to the continent.

I think we have to explore the negotiation route before we go the violent route, and that is going to be the issue that is in front of us. Let us stay focused on what we should do and not all of these other peripheral things

such as travel and all sorts of other peripheral issues of different leaders.

PROPAGANDA IN SUPPORT OF COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

(Mr. RUDD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, I just received a full page advertisement from a constituent in Arizona. I do not know how to describe it except to say that it is just ridiculous.

It is published by a group called "U.S. Out of Central America," and it pictures several dead bodies, including a small child, which could have been filmed anywhere in the world. But the ad declares that the Nicaraguan Contras are responsible. The act of ad distribution is nothing short of irresponsible and it is dangerous.

War is hell and its tragedy is not acceptable but why is no mention made of the atrocities committed by the Communist Sandinista regime? And the question comes to mind as to who funded this outfit, this "U.S. Out of Central America," group that they could saturate all of America with a rotten irresponsible ad like that?

The Permanent Commission on Human Rights, founded in Managua in 1977, reports hundreds of cases of prisoners who disappear after being detained by the Sandinistas; more than 100 cases of physical and psychological torture of detainees; mass arbitrary arrests and political killings. What about the genocide committed against the Miskito Indians, the massive military buildup and Sandinista support for subversion and terror in neighboring countries in Central America—as a matter of fact, all of Latin America?

□ 1250

Do we want to subject all of Central America to this terror? Are we willing to stand up to Communist Marxist aggression and help those fighting to restore democracy and freedom? Let us recognize that the United States out of Central America can be nothing else but propaganda in support of Communist aggression in the Western Hemisphere.

LOWER DEFICIT AND BETTER FARM POLICY, TWIN OBJECTIVES

(Mr. PENNY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, we have a tendency around here to deal with an issue for several weeks and then move on to other things as if somehow we have solved that issue once and for all.

Earlier this year, we dealt with the farm crisis. Then more recently we

moved on to the budget crisis. Now we are moving on to other matters.

Yet the farm crisis and the budget crisis were not resolved. They are as real today as they were during those weeks that we devoted our attention to those matters. It is incumbent on us to continue to focus on these two very real problems in American society. In fact these two items are closely related.

I call on the members of our conference committee to work with the Senate on the budget to maximize the deficit reduction because if we can get the deficit down, we can benefit our farm economy through lower interest rates, through better exports, and better prices.

I call on my colleagues in the Agriculture Committee to work as well toward a better farm policy. By the end of this season, I want to say that in the area of the budget deficit and the farm crisis, we tackled the problems.

RATIFY SALT II NOW

(Mr. AuCOIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Speaker, today I commend President Reagan for refusing to break out of SALT II.

That a lifelong arms control opponent such as Ronald Reagan could find himself forced by reality to support the SALT II limits is a demonstration of the overwhelming merit of the treaty.

This is good.

I wish I could now say we've turned the corner at Geneva. Unfortunately, there seems to be little or no basis for hope that any national security benefit will come out of that exercise.

But there's another route to arms reduction. We, here in Washington, have the power to force the Soviets to promptly reduce their deployed strategic weapons launchers 10 percent. We could do it without a single negotiating session, and in a way that would win applause among our allies.

All we have to do is ratify SALT II. All we have to do is to formalize the kind of actions Mr. Reagan announced yesterday.

The President has taken one good step. Now it should serve national security by requesting that SALT II be ratified.

SANDINISTA REFORMS INDOCTRINATE CHILDREN INTO LEFTIST PHILOSOPHY

(Mr. LAGOMARSINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, news reports from Nicaragua recon-

firm popular opposition to the Sandinistas forcing Marxist-Leninist education on the young people of that country.

The Union of Parents of Christian Families has publicly denounced Sandinista reforms requiring indoctrination of their children in its leftist philosophy. The president of the Union Sofonias Cisneros told the newspaper *La Prensa*, "our families have been replaced by the state. In democratic countries, the father takes charge of his child's education. Here and in other Communist nations, the state has taken the right."

Cisneros gave examples of the doctrinal messages carried in the primary school textbooks, such as a grammar text which uses the following sentence as an example of proper sentence structure: "One has to fight to win victory under the direction of our organization, the FSLN." Also, to learn arithmetic, children must count piles of rifles and grenades.

When I was in Nicaragua in March with Congressman MIKE DEWINE, we heard similar complaints, particularly from the Catholic Church, where Catholic private schools are forced to include Marxist-Leninist theory in their classrooms. There can be no doubt the intention of the Sandinistas is to indoctrinate the young people of Nicaragua in their leftist, revolutionary philosophy.

LET THE SUN SHINE IN

(Mr. ECKART of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ECKART of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, recently the Nuclear Regulatory Commission succeeded in closing the doors to some of their meetings, effectively locking out the public. And no longer will the very people whose very safety depends on the agency's rules and regulations have access to the transcript and the meetings held on their behalf.

Soon Congressman GERRY SIKORSKI from Minnesota and I will be introducing legislation to pry open the NRC's door of secrecy. The discussions that form the basis for safe nuclear policy must once again be open to public scrutiny. People who live in the vicinity of nuclear powerplants, Mr. Speaker, must be able to trust that the decisions made by the NRC are in their interests, not of the powerful special interests.

How can they have that sort of confidence if the Commission insists that its gatherings be held in secret?

They cannot. That is why I urge my fellow colleagues to support my efforts to open the doors of the NRC and let the Sun shine in. Public confidence, open government, and public opinion demand that we lift the shroud of se-

crecy and let the public decisions be truly made in the public.

PENSION AND EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION OF OLDER WORKERS MUST CEASE

(Mr. BIAGGI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, we continue to subject older workers to financial and employment discrimination despite the passage of the 1978 Age Discrimination in Employment Act.

To address this problem, today I am introducing the Older Workers Employment Protection Act—that will require employers to accrue pension benefits for workers over 65. Now, half of all workers in ERISA-covered pension plans are provided this protection, which means that the remaining 50 percent are not. My bill will also eliminate the remaining provisions of mandatory retirement by lifting the age 70 cap for workers in the private sector. This is virtually identical to my bill of the 98th Congress—which was the subject of hearings late last year by the Education and Labor Committee.

Failure to accrue pension benefits for older workers can translate into a loss of 4 to 23 percent of their pensions if they work until age 67. This loss can be even greater—up to 50 percent—if that same employee works until age 70.

We place older workers in double jeopardy if on one hand—we eliminate age discrimination—yet on the other hand—we fail to protect their pension benefits from backdoor discrimination. If an employee wishes to remain on the job past age 65—there is no justifiable reason why that same employee should not continue to accrue pension benefits until retirement.

Finally, this bill also assures that older workers—5 years from retirement—will be allowed to participate in ERISA-covered plans.

Let us strike a blow for fairness and equity—and strike a blow against remaining barriers in the workplace that keep many of our most valued employees from continuing to work based on their ability—not their age.

□ 1300

THE "SECRET SPEECH"

(Mr. KASICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most revealing events regarding the Sandinista government's true goals has been all but overlooked by the American news media. In May 1984, Commandante Bayardo Arce, one of the nine Nicaraguan junta lead-

ers, gave a speech in Managua. The speech was supposed to be secret, but was tape recorded without Arce's knowledge and reprinted by the Spanish newspaper *La Vanguardia*. Subsequently, even Daniel Ortega acknowledged the authenticity of the speech.

What is so very important about the speech is that it is an open admission from the Sandinista leadership that the Nicaraguan elections were a sham designed to trick gullible Americans into believing Nicaragua was committed to democracy. Furthermore, the commandante frankly admitted that the Soviet Union told the Sandinistas not to declare themselves to be Communists, so that the free world would not recognize Nicaragua for what it is. Perhaps the most telling comment is the quote: "We've talked about this being the first experience of building socialism with the dollars of capitalism." That, Mr. Speaker, is the Sandinista program in a nutshell, and in their own words. We must finally remove the obstacle of partisanship and see that the Sandinistas are frankly admitting they are totalitarian Communists.

THE PRESIDENT'S DECISION ON SALT II LAUNCHER LIMITS

(Mr. DICKS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President made an important choice between the advocates of arms control and those who seize every opportunity to undercut the arms control process.

I believe the President's decision was prudent from a military perspective. The 1,200 limit on multiple warhead missile launchers, if breached by the United States, could have potentially allowed the Soviets to add 5,000 to 10,000 additional warheads to their existing large ICBM force. Clearly, that is why the Joint Chiefs urged no undercut of SALT II launcher limits.

Now we must decide how to respond to Soviet violations of existing agreements. Proportionality is the issue. Let us make certain that we make responses that make sense and do not lead to a needless escalation in the arms race. Let us call on the Soviets in Geneva and at the SCC to settle these troublesome violations.

The President's decision will aid our negotiations in Geneva and will help our relationships with our allies. I hope that the Soviets will now respond by ending practices that violate existing arms control agreements.

The President has exercised good judgment. I hope the Soviet leadership will respond positively, and in the same spirit.

A GOOD DECISION, MR. PRESIDENT

(Mr. WEISS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the privilege of meeting with a delegation of survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The atomic bombs dropped on those cities almost 40 years ago changed the condition of humanity forever. After those two cataclysmic events, it became obvious as the words of a hit country record of that day stated, there would be "peace in the world or the world in pieces."

Arms control efforts have been difficult to achieve. Humanity barely survives on the razor's edge of potential nuclear annihilation. Ronald Reagan has not often played a constructive role in moving the world back from the precipice, but his decision yesterday not to undercut the unratified SALT II Treaty was as welcome as it was historic. Given his prior positions on the treaty and the opposition from Secretary of Defense Weinberger and the extreme right wing of the Republican Party, his decision could not have been an easy one.

All of humanity can heave a great sigh of relief.

It was a good decision, Mr. President, I applaud it; people around the world enthusiastically approve it. Hopefully, it will make even more constructive steps possible to free us from the threat of an unrestrained arms race in the heavens and on Earth.

PROBLEMS WITH THE TAX REFORM PROPOSAL

(Mr. LUKEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUKEN. Mr. Speaker, it is now clear that President Reagan has succeeded in devising a plan to achieve one of his goals for tax "reform"—rewarding the wealthy at the expense of the middle income group.

Yesterday, my Small Business Subcommittee on Tax heard from a Cincinnati accountant who painstakingly filled out 1040's for several categories of taxpayers under current law and under the Reagan plan. This exercise showed that for Ohio taxpayers the President's plan would result in higher taxes of \$421 for a childless couple earning \$45,000 where both work. A married couple with an income of \$26,000 with two children and one worker would pay \$12 more in taxes.

Who, then, are the beneficiaries of this "reform"? Those who earn \$200,000 with one wage earner and two children would save more than \$7,000. Those earning \$500,000 would save

almost \$30,000 per year, about \$600 per week.

The President may have succeeded. He's managed to move the debate on tax reform away from the central issue of the progressivity of our tax system—which is the basis of its fairness.

We already knew that. Tax reform from this administration flunks outright on simplicity, and, as we look closely gets very low marks for equity and fairness.

I agree with Lee Iacocca, we don't have our priorities in order, when we put tax overhaul before cutting the national debt and trade deficits.

CENTRAL AMERICA: A DOSE OF REALITY

(Mr. GONZALEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Senate voted last week to provide \$38 million to the Nicaraguan Contras. The House has before it this week two narrower proposals, but what we all realize is that it does not really matter what is passed at this point—the result of providing aid in any form to the Contras is to escalate U.S. involvement in the Nicaragua war.

It is pointless to label any aid we provide as “humanitarian” aid, since by providing any funding at all we are helping to arm the Contras.

We are not fooling the American people by calling this aid humanitarian or nonlethal. One can argue, for example, that providing instruction to soldiers is nonlethal aid, but the result of such aid is decidedly lethal. It's like providing nonlethal aid in the form of clubhouses to the Hell's Angels, the result is the same: They'll go out and terrorize the neighborhood.

Under this administration, the situation in Central America has worsened. The situation in Nicaragua is deplorable, and peace is no closer at hand than it was 4 years ago. This administration's policies are undefined, unarticulated, and ineffective—and \$14 million or \$38 million or however much aid the Contras might get from us now is not going to make any difference. Just as the previous millions of dollars we have provided have not been effective. The President is merely keeping the door open for more aid and a deeper U.S. involvement.

Remember what happened in Lebanon. The President did not stop there as the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended—he was forced to stop only after we lost 260 marines. And now, as the Joint Chiefs of Staff are advising the President not to get involved militarily in Nicaragua, the President is leading us step by step in that direction, refusing to heed the warnings of our top military leaders.

Mr. Speaker, the President may be asking for millions of dollars today,

but he will be asking for hundreds and thousands of lives tomorrow. Is the U.S. Congress willing to accept responsibility for a war with Central America?

WE SHOULD HELP NICARAGUANS REPLACE COMMUNISM WITH FREEDOM IN THEIR OWN COUNTRY

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a number of Democrats come to the floor today and talk about the Nicaraguan situation. What they have said, essentially, is no help, not even humanitarian help, to those Nicaraguans who are attempting to replace communism with freedom in their own country.

□ 1310

If we do not help those who are fighting the Communist government in their own country, are we then willing to accept at face value those Communists? One has to guess that that is precisely the policy that many Democrats are advocating. They keep saying they oppose the Nicaraguan Communists, but they are not willing to do those things necessary to stop the Communists. They are willing to write off as unimportant the ties of the Nicaraguan Communists to the totality of the world Communist movement, including, evidently, Ortega's trip to Moscow. They send Members of this House to deal directly with that Communist government. They evidently seek not to stop communism in our hemisphere but to accommodate it.

Well, that is the real question before us as we approach the discussion of the Michel amendment. Which side are you on, the side of the question that supports the freedom fighters, or the side of this question that accommodates the Communists?

I doubt many of your constituents will agree that this House should adopt a policy of accommodation, capitulation and, ultimately, retreat in Nicaragua. But it is our choice.

NO U.S. FOREIGN AID FUNDS USED FOR ABORTIONS

(Mr. KOSTMAYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in a “Dear Colleague” letter, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP] again misled the House and the American people when he charged that our foreign aid dollars are being used by international organizations that support or participate “in the management of a program of coercive abortion.”

Although I do not question the gentleman's sincerity, I question his fast and loose misuse of the facts. The Helms amendment of 1974 and the Snowe amendment adopted by the Foreign Affairs Committee amply ensure that no U.S. foreign aid funds are used directly or indirectly for abortions anywhere or anytime in the world.

In addition, the Reagan-appointed AID Administrator, Peter McPherson, has informed the Congress that “The U.N. Fund for Population Activities neither funds abortions nor supports coercive family planning practices through its program.”

Mr. KEMP's efforts to gut family planning in the Third World will dramatically increase the number of abortions occurring there each year.

JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF REFORM MEASURES IN THE MILITARY COMMAND REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1985

(Mr. SKELTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, when President Reagan unveiled his tax simplification proposal last week, he promised to replace a system that has become “unwise, unwanted and unfair.” The evolution of tax reform dates back to Presidents Kennedy, Nixon and Ford. Mr. Speaker, the issue of military Joint Chiefs of Staff reform parallels this protracted evolution and likewise is considered to be a system that is “unwise, unwanted and unfair.” Unfair, because the current Joint Chiefs of Staff structure requires a service chief to perform two jobs at once—leading his service and performing as a member of the JCS.

This problem of having to perform two jobs is not new. In 1958 President Eisenhower, in his message to Congress, emphasized that, “. . . the Joint Chiefs' burdens are so heavy that they find it very difficult to spend adequate time on their duties as members of the JCS. The problem is not new but has not yielded to past efforts to solve it.” And more recently, the 1982 Special Study Group highlighted another aspect of the problem of excessive time demands: “. . . the Chiefs must travel extensively to meet their own service leadership obligations. . . . Their travel schedules make it hard for the JCS to maintain continuity as a working group; . . . only one-quarter of the time [over the past 5 years] were all five principals present [at JCS meetings].”

Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of the tax reform initiative, as with the issue of JCS reform, we must recognize this as a great opportunity for change. Clear-

ly, the problems of the JCS have been with us too long. Clearly, these problems are inherent in organizational arrangements which violate established principles of good management.

The bill I am proposing to reform the JCS addresses this fundamental flaw. The gains we made in the 98th Congress on JCS reform must be used to carry us through to completion this year.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Are there further 1-minute speeches to be requested?

If not, the 1-minute speeches will be concluded with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

LET'S CUT OUT THE DOUBLE-TALK

(Mr. MARKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, today, the Republicans are trooping out the latest costume for covert war in Nicaragua. But the issue today is the same one we've debated for the last 3 years.

Should we be in the business of trying to overthrow another government?

Let's be honest with the American people. Humanitarian assistance to the Contras is an oxymoron.

It is not humanitarian to supply an army in the field. That's funding violence, not alleviating suffering.

Combat boots, K-rations, helicopters and radar are not humanitarian aid.

Are you going to tell the people in Managua that it was a humanitarian airplane that dropped a bomb in their neighborhood?

Are you going to tell peasants that it was humanitarian dynamite that blew up their farm?

And let's debate what we are voting on. The issue is not the Sandinistas. The issue is the Contras.

When the Republican leaders talk about the Contras, I feel like little Red Riding Hood. They've got the Contras all dressed up like a saintly grandmother; but, my what long teeth that wolf has.

Let's cut out the double-talk.

Either you support an undeclared war against Nicaragua, or you don't.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House of following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 10, 1985.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR Mr. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5, Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House at 2:15 p.m. on Monday, June 10, 1985, and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits a classified report as required by Section 1110 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985 (P.L. 98-525).

With kind regards, I am
Sincerely,

BENJAMIN J. GUTHRIE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

REPORT ON U.S. SECURITY INTERESTS AND CERTAIN ARMS AGREEMENTS, A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of yesterday, Monday, June 10, 1985, at page 15020.)

□ 1320

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend his remarks on the further consideration of H.R. 2577, supplemental appropriations bill, 1985, and that I may include extraneous and tabular matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1985

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2577) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1321

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of

the bill, H.R. 2577, with Mr. BROWN of California in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, June 6, 1985, the Clerk had read through line 9 on page 28.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ENGLISH

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ENGLISH: On page 27, line 1, strike all after "Geneva-on-the-Lake, Ohio:", down through "Arkansas-Red River Basin;" on line 6 and insert the following:

Red River Chloride Control, Oklahoma and Texas: Provided, That Section 201 of the Flood Control Act of 1970, as amended by Section 153 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976, is amended by striking out the last sentence under the heading "Arkansas-Red River Basin" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Construction shall not be initiated on any element of such project involving the Arkansas River and/or its tributaries until such element has been approved by the Secretary of the Army. The chloride control projects for the Red River Basin and the Arkansas River Basin shall be considered to be authorized as separate projects, with separate authority under Section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1966, as amended."

Mr. ENGLISH (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, at the request of my colleagues from Oklahoma, I ask unanimous consent to strike the words on line 10 "and/or its tributaries," and replace that language with the word "Basin," so that it reads "Arkansas River Basin until such element."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to retain existing law, which requires the Secretary of the Army to grant approval for any element of the Arkansas River Basin water quality control project before construction on that element may be initiated.

As reported from the House Appropriations Committee, H.R. 2577 would allow construction on the Arkansas River Basin water quality project to occur without approval of the Secretary of the Army. It is highly unlikely that the Secretary would ever grant such approval because the Army Corps of Engineers found that for every \$1 spent on the project, only 25 cents in benefits would result. Some would argue that construction on this project should not occur with or without the

Secretary's approval. But, requiring the Secretary of the Army to grant specific approval is an added assurance for the American taxpayer that construction on the project will not be initiated. Without my amendment, however, taxpayers in your district would be vulnerable to paying unintended expenses incurred in the construction of this water project.

My amendment also separates authorization of the Arkansas River Basin water quality project from the Red River Basin water quality project. The intent of this separation is to ensure that no money authorized and appropriated for the Red River Basin water quality project can be spent on any portion of the Arkansas River Basin water quality project. This amendment is in line with legislation developed by the Oklahoma delegation which I introduced and which the House adopted during its consideration last year of H.R. 3678, the Water Resources Conservation, Development and Infrastructure Improvement and Rehabilitation Act of 1983.

By separating the Arkansas River chloride control project from the Red River chloride control project, my amendment requires that each project stands on its own merits. Unfortunately, present law permits funding authorized and intended for the Red River project to be spent on the Arkansas River project. This could happen despite the fact that the Corps of Engineers has concluded after extensive study that the Arkansas River project is not economically feasible and that the corps should not proceed with it.

A closer look at the Arkansas project reveals the actual scope of this billion-dollar question-mark. Basically, the Arkansas River Basin project contains a series of shallow salt brine ponds which would be used to collect, store, divert, and dispose of salt brine. These ponds would require the sacrifice of at least 60,000 acres of land in western Oklahoma.

Congress authorized the Arkansas project in the Flood Control Act of 1970. At the same time, and using the same provision, Congress authorized construction on sites for the Red River project. In 1977, corps officials testified that unless Congress was prepared to make a total commitment to the complete Arkansas project, the Congress should not support any part of it. Furthermore, at that time, the corps was not prepared to give its go-ahead for the entire project. In 1981, 10 years after the initial authorization, the corps rejected plans to proceed with the Arkansas project. Specifically, the corps found that for every \$1 spent on the project, only 25 cents would be returned in benefits. This ratio was substantially lower than the required dollar-for-dollar cost-to-benefit ratio. The corps recom-

mended tabling the project until a significant change occurred which "clearly demonstrates a greater need and probable use of the improved water." This has yet to happen, and I doubt it ever will. Additionally, the corps stated that the "environmental analysis showed that there would not be outstanding contributions to the environmental quality account to offset the lack of economic benefits."

Taxpayers from throughout Oklahoma have expressed their concern over and opposition to the Arkansas project. By separating the authorization of the two projects, however, we can at least ensure that funding intended for the Red River Basin project does not end up spent on the Arkansas River Basin project. It is also important that we maintain present law which prohibits any construction on the Arkansas River Basin water quality project without the prior approval of the Secretary of the Army. Thousands of tax dollars have been spent on corps studies of the Arkansas River Basin project. The conclusions and recommendations of these studies should be followed and not ignored and circumvented. I urge the House to support my amendment.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLISH. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BEVILL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment, and agree with the gentleman that it is a good amendment. We accept it.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For an additional amount for "General Investigations", to remain available until expended, \$1,200,000 with which the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to undertake studies of the Buffalo Harbor, New York; St. Petersburg Harbor, Florida; Tangier Island, Virginia; South Kohala water supply, Hawaii; West Onslow Beach and New River Inlet, North Carolina; Meredosia; Willow Creek, and Coon Run Drainage and Levee District, Illinois; (AE&D); and a reconnaissance study of the feasibility of making the Wabash River navigable under the authorized Wabash River Basin Comprehensive Study; and in addition, the Secretary of the Army is directed to proceed with the feasibility phase of the Brunswick Harbor, Georgia, study at full Federal expense, using funds made available in Public Law 98-360; and in addition, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to conduct and complete the feasibility

phase of the Red River Basin, Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana, and Oklahoma Comprehensive Study and the Arkansas River and Tributaries, South Central and Southeast Areas of Oklahoma Comprehensive Study in accordance with the directives contained in Public Law 98-63 and the House report accompanying this bill.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For an additional amount for "Construction, General", to remain available until expended, \$7,500,000 for the construction, at full Federal expense, of facilities at the Mill Creek recreation area of the Tioga-Hammond Lakes project in Pennsylvania which would typically be cost shared, making a special effort to adapt such authorized facilities to the specific needs of the handicapped, provided that local interests develop specialized facilities to include buildings, lodges, demonstration centers, and non-water oriented equipment, and accept full responsibility for operation and maintenance of the entire recreation area which must be made available to the general public: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed to utilize funds heretofore appropriated for Construction, General to carry out engineering and design and acquisition of land for Gallipolis Locks and Dam, Ohio and West Virginia; Locks and Dam 26, Illinois and Missouri Second Lock; Monongahela River, Grays Landing (Lock No. 7), Pennsylvania; Monongahela River, Point Marion (Lock No. 8), Pennsylvania and West Virginia; William Bacon Oliver Lock and Dam, Alabama; Bonnevill Navigation Lock, including necessary relocations, Oregon and Washington; and Winfield Lock and Dam, West Virginia.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

For an additional amount for "Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies", \$25,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, General", to remain available until expended, \$2,600,000 with which the Corps of Engineers is directed to construct recreation facilities at Sepulveda Dam, California.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Secretary of the Army is directed to construct recreation facilities at the Quachita and Black Rivers, Arkansas and Louisiana; New Melones Lake, California; Saylorville Lake, Iowa; Copan Lake, Oklahoma; and Sardis Lake, Oklahoma, projects at full Federal expense, in accordance with Public Law 98-360 (H. Rept. 98-866) using funds heretofore or hereafter provided.

Within available funds, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed to perform necessary channel and associated work in connection with the Turtle Creek, Pennsylvania, local protection project; and shall take such action as may be necessary to remove accumulated snags and other debris blocking the channel of the Hatchie River and its tributaries in the vicinity of Bridge Creek and the Little Hatchie River in Mississippi; and shall take such action as may be necessary to perform necessary channel and associated work in connection with the Glencoe, Alabama, flood control project.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my concern over a provision of this chap-

ter found at pages 34 through 37 relating to the authorization of a project on the Toutle, Cowlitz, and Columbia Rivers in the State of Washington.

One of my concerns with this provision is that unlike most authorizations that are reported from the Public Works Committee, this one does not contain any limitation on the Federal costs of this project. I wonder whether any of the members of the committee who are familiar with this provision could provide some information on the cost to which we are obligating ourselves in this authorization.

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, as he knows, in this supplemental there is no amount appropriated for this project. It is simply a matter of authorization which is necessary if the Corps of Engineers is going to proceed with implementing a long-term solution to the Mount St. Helens sediment problem.

With respect to the gentleman's specific question, while there is no appropriation involved the ultimate cost, as it has been estimated by the Corps of Engineers for the construction of that single retention structure, is \$194 million.

□ 1330

Beyond that, dredging will be required as construction on the dam proceeds over that period of time. So that is the amount involved.

Mr. PETRI. I thank the gentleman.

Have either the authorizing or appropriation committees held any hearings on this project?

Mr. BONKER. If the gentleman will yield further, I would defer to the gentleman from Oregon, who is a prominent member of the subcommittee. I have testified a number of times before the Appropriations Committee, as has the Corps of Engineers. We have been subject to a number of questions and inquiries about the nature and the scope of the project.

Beyond that, the corps has conducted public hearings in the State with respect to the comprehensive plan and also on a feasibility report. So there has been ample opportunity for public and private input.

Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PETRI. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. AuCOIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I do not serve on this subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee but I am a member of the full Appropriations Committee and have worked very closely with the able chairman, the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. BEVILL, who is the chairman of the subcommittee.

The answer to the gentleman's question is: Yes; there have been hearings in which questions have been posed to both the Assistant Secretary and the

Pacific Northwest Division of the Corps of Engineers. I think the data base and the record built by that committee is extensive. It points to a very real need here that my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BONKER] my good friend, has alluded to, and Mr. BONKER is correct that in late 1983 there were, in addition, comprehensive hearings in the field conducted by the Corps of this question on the comprehensive plan as well as on the single-retention structure.

Mr. PETRI. I thank the gentlemen for their answers, and I have one final question which one or the other may wish to answer.

Has the Corps of Engineers calculated a benefit-cost ratio for this project?

Mr. BONKER. If the gentleman will yield, the cost-benefit ratio is 1.55 to 1, so the Government is going to come out ahead 1½ times by proceeding with this project.

I am glad the gentleman has raised this issue because we are dealing with an ongoing problem with respect to Mount St. Helens. We read about it from time to time in the newspaper about the dome-building phenomenon, the vibrations and the possibility of future eruptions. That is not the problem.

The problem goes back to May 1980 and the first eruption. Since then, we have had continuing problems with downstream sediment filling up the Toutle River and then the Cowlitz River, and eventually the Columbia River. What that does is make the whole area prone to flooding because as soon as those rivers fill up with the sediment, then when the snow melts in the spring rains, it will threaten the 60,000 to 70,000 people who live at the bottom of that river and who most certainly would be flooded out.

This has all been substantiated by the Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Geological Service. Not only that, but the mud slides would make their way into the Columbia River, thereby inhibiting the commerce in and out of that river, which is vital to the economy of the Northwest.

Let me finally point out that we have spent \$360 million on dredging since 1980 to keep those rivers clean. It involves not only dredging, but acquiring space to dump the sediment. If the environmentalists are concerned, they ought to be tremendously concerned about where we are going to put all of the sediment, 700 million cubic yards, that will have to be dredged over the long period.

This single retention structure will catch that mud when it comes down, instead of depositing it all the way downstream and having to be dredged. By proceeding with this project, we will benefit considerably. If we do nothing, the corps tells us that the dredging will cost twice as much.

Mr. PETRI. I thank the gentleman for his answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PETRI was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETRI. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. AuCOIN. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

At the risk of prolonging this, I would like to make a couple of points to the gentleman in answer to the question he has posed.

In 1980, the eruption that took place blasted 3 billion cubic yards of debris in the North Fork of the Toutle River. It is a massive amount of material. It created a debris avalanche which is 15 miles long, up to 1¼ miles wide and about 150 feet deep. It now threatens to inundate both the Cowlitz and the Columbia Rivers with silted sand and that really is the problem.

In testimony by the Corps earlier this year, it was stated that unless we authorize by October 1 this single-retention structure, we will have crippled our chances to contain this debris avalanche. If we do not move forward now, we really do risk the clogging of both these rivers, and what that means to the vital shipping for international trade to this region of the country is substantial, not to mention the drain on the Treasury in continued dredging of the debris that will come into those rivers.

Mr. PETRI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETRI. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just like to say to my very good friend from Wisconsin that this project has been scrutinized over and over again by the administration, by the Corps. My good friend, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BONKER] has done an enormous amount of work on this project and I can tell you that this committee has reviewed it very, very carefully, very closely.

In my judgment, this is the absolute correct answer. Without it, we could risk several billions of dollars in property damage to the communities below this area. This single-retention facility has been thoroughly analyzed and I believe it is the correct decision for this important project.

Mr. PETRI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Notwithstanding any existing agreement, within funds otherwise available for the Yazoo Basin, the Corps of Engineers is directed to operate and maintain the McKinney Bayou Pumping Plan in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 678 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 15, 1936, as amended by Public Law 526 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, approved July 24, 1946, effective after the date of enactment of this Act.

Section 105 of Public Law 98-360 is amended by striking the words "at a cost not to exceed \$450,000", and inserting in lieu thereof, the words "at an estimated cost of \$735,000".

The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to construct the beach erosion control project for Langdon Park, Wilmette, Illinois, under the authority of Section 103 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962, as amended, and in accordance with the cost-sharing provisions in the Final Detailed Project Report, dated September 1983, at a total estimated cost of \$270,000.

Section 14 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1152; 33 U.S.C. 408), is amended by inserting a colon in place of the period at the end of the section and inserting thereafter: "Provided further, That the Secretary may, on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers, grant permission for the alteration or permanent occupation or use of any of the aforementioned public works when in the judgment of the Secretary such occupation or use will not be injurious to the public interest and will not impair the usefulness of such work."

The Secretary of the Army is directed to initiate continuation of planning and engineering studies for the Maumee Bay State Park, Ohio, project at full Federal expense, using funds made available in Public Law 98-360.

The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall grant, within ninety days of enactment of this Act, to the University of Alabama at Huntsville the funds appropriated to the Secretary of the Army pursuant to Title I of Public Law 98-50 for the design and construction of a Corps of Engineers learning facility at Huntsville, Alabama. This grant shall be made to the University of Alabama at Huntsville subject to the conditions that the University will convey the grant funds to the Chief of Engineers to design and construct the learning facility on lands owned by the University of Alabama and the completed facility is to be owned and maintained by the University and be operated by the University and the Corps as a joint use facility, all according to such specifications, terms, and cost sharing arrangements for operation and maintenance as the University of Alabama at Huntsville and the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, may agree. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate on a monthly basis on the status of the required agreements and the construction of the learning facility until such time as the facility is constructed and operational at the University of Alabama at Huntsville.

The authorization for the Sardis Lake project, Oklahoma, contained in Section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962, as amended by Section 108 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriation Act of 1982 is

hereby amended to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to plan, design, and construct access road improvements to the existing road from the west end of Sardis Lake to Daisy, Oklahoma, at an estimated Federal cost of \$10,000,000 and the State or political subdivision shall agree to operate and maintain said facilities at their own expense.

Notwithstanding and other provision of law, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is hereby authorized to enter into a purchase contract for the acquisition of new buildings and appurtenant facilities for the United States Army Engineer District, Walla Walla, Washington. Such buildings and facilities shall be constructed on a suitable site in the Walla Walla, Washington area, which the Chief of Engineers is authorized to acquire for that purpose. The contract shall provide for the payment of the purchase price, which shall not exceed \$12,000,000, and reasonable interest thereon, by lease or installment payments over a period not to exceed 25 years. The contract shall further provide that the title to the building and facilities shall vest in the United States at or before the expiration of the contract term upon fulfillment of the terms and conditions of the contract.

The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to design, construct, operate, and maintain a Federal project for reduction of both flood damage and navigation maintenance on the Toutle, Cowlitz and Columbia Rivers, Washington. Specifically, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers is authorized to construct a single stage retention structure near the confluence of the Toutle and Green Rivers with such design features as the Chief of Engineers determines to be advisable, including justified measures to mitigate for adverse environmental impacts associated with the project; except that, based on the results of Continuation of Planning and Engineering studies, the Secretary of the Army may select and implement a staged sediment retention structure at the confluence of the Toutle and Green Rivers or dredging alternative on the Toutle, Cowlitz and Columbia Rivers if he determines that continuing monitoring of sedimentation and further analysis of benefits and costs provide compelling and convincing new evidence to justify selection of a staged retention structure or dredging alternative.

Prior to initiation of measures authorized by this section, non-Federal interests shall agree to:

(1) convey or otherwise provide to the United States, all lands, easements, and rights-of-way which the Chief of Engineers determines to be necessary for project construction and maintenance, including borrow sites for the removal of material needed for retaining works and disposal sites for the disposal of excavated material;

(2) accomplish any alteration or relocation of buildings, roads, bridges, or other structures or utilities which the Chief of Engineers determines to be necessary in connection with implementation of the project;

(3) in the event local interests are unable to comply with requirements (1) or (2) above in a timely manner, provide a cash contribution to the United States, at such times and in such amounts as the Chief of Engineers determines to be necessary to allow acquisition of the property by the United States in accordance with project construction schedules;

(4) hold and save the United States free from damage due to design, construction, operation, and maintenance of the project except damages due to the fault or negligence of the United States or its contractors;

(5) operate and maintain any Federally undertaken mitigation project which the Chief of Engineers determines to be justified; and,

(6) maintain all dredged material disposal sites.

All items of local cooperation shall be provided at the time needed, as determined by the Chief of Engineers, and without cost to the United States; except in the event the Secretary of the Army selects a staged sediment retention structure or dredging alternative rather than the single stage sediment retention structure, any increase this selection causes in the cost of local cooperation requirements, as determined by the Secretary of the Army, will be reimbursed by the Federal Government.

Any goods and services purchased by the United States in connection with the project authorized pursuant to this section shall not be subject to the tax imposed by Chapters 82.04, 82.08, and 82.14 of the Revised Code of Washington and made applicable to contractors of the United States pursuant to Section 82.04.190(6) of the Revised Code of Washington.

The Corps of Engineers is authorized and directed to initiate Continuation of Planning and Engineering for the Virginia Beach, Virginia beach erosion and hurricane protection project, using available funds.

From funds available to the Corps of Engineers such sums as may be required shall be made available to complete the recreation facilities on the northern part of the Tennessee-Tombigbee navigation project as described in Volume 2, Appendix D of the Final Supplement to the Environmental Impact Statement provided to the Environmental Protection Agency and the United States District Court but under the same terms and conditions as those initiated prior to fiscal year 1983.

From Construction, General funds heretofore or herein appropriated, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall pay the judgment and any associated interest, resulting from the decision of the Engineer Board of Contract Appeals in ENG BCA Docket Number 4815 (April 16, 1985), notwithstanding the limitation on allotment of Section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (Public Law No. 86-645), as amended (33 U.S.C. 577). Nothing in this provision affects the obligations of the non-Federal sponsor to the United States of America for the work involved.

The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to construct the Miami Harbor, Bayfront Park, Florida project under the authority of Public Laws 98-50 and 98-360 except that east-west connector, known as the promenade, which is necessary for park development, shall be at Federal expense.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

For an additional amount for the "Construction program", to remain available until expended, \$20,850,000; of which \$1,550,000 shall be available for transfers to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund as authorized by section 5 of the Act of April 11, 1956 (43 U.S.C. 620d): *Provided*, That of the

total appropriated, the amount for program activities which can be financed by the Reclamation Fund may be derived from that Fund: *Provided further*, That of the total appropriated, \$8,300,000 is appropriated pursuant to the Snyder Act (25 U.S.C. 13), to be expended by the Bureau of Reclamation for the purpose of designing and initiating construction of the Headgate Rock Hydroelectric project, Arizona: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended for construction of the Animas-LaPlata Participating Project, Colorado-New Mexico until: (1) an agreement has been executed between the Secretary of the Interior and non-Federal entities in Colorado and/or New Mexico providing for such non-Federal entities to contribute a reasonable portion of the total project costs; and (2) such agreement has been submitted to the Congress and 120 calendar days have elapsed. The authority of the Secretary of the Interior to obligate or expend the funds made available for the Animas-LaPlata Project in this Act shall lapse if the agreement required by this paragraph has not been reached by September 30, 1986.

INDEPENDENT AGENCY

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

There is appropriated an additional \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended, for the "Tennessee Valley Authority Fund" for the conduct of a demonstration project for the construction of a main water transmission line.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FAZIO

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] reserves a point of order against the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FAZIO: PAGE 39, AFTER LINE 18 INSERT:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

To the extent the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has authority or jurisdiction under the Federal Power Act of a Memorandum of Understanding for the California-Oregon Transmission Project, dated December 19, 1984 (50 F.R. 420, Jan. 3, 1985), as amended and supplemented by the Secretary of Energy prior to enactment of this paragraph, or of any contracts implementing such Memorandum, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission shall exercise such authority or jurisdiction within two years after enactment of this paragraph or after the filing of any such contract, whichever is later, and the Commission shall adjust its procedures and practices to ensure completion of such exercise of administrative authority or jurisdiction within such two-year period. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed by the Commission or any court as affecting, changing or limiting the authority, jurisdiction or procedures of the Commission under the Federal Power Act concerning rates, charges, service, facilities, classification, access or other matters in regard to such project. Consistent with the provisions of Public Law 98-360 which authorized the Secretary of Energy to construct or participate in the construction of such project for the benefit of electric con-

sumers of the Pacific Northwest and California and obtain compensation from non-Federal participants in such project, sufficient capacity shall be reserved, as recognized in such Memorandum, to serve the needs of the Department of Energy Laboratories and wildlife refuges in California. The Secretary of Energy and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission shall keep the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate fully and currently informed concerning the project, any changes in such Memorandum of Understanding (as so amended and supplemented), the implementing contracts, compensation, reserved capacity for such laboratories or refuges, actions under the Federal Power Act, and any related matters. Nothing in this Act or in the Memorandum shall in anyway affect, modify, change, or expand the authorities or policies of the Bonneville Power Administration under existing law regarding wholesale power rates, transmission rates, or transmission access.

□ 1340

Mr. FAZIO (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment I am offering at this point facilitates the construction of an essentially Federal 1,600-megawatt transmission line between California and the Pacific Northwest.

The \$400 million cost will be financed entirely by non-Federal users. This is not even a case of full repayment; it is a case of full non-Federal financing.

The line can help tap into vast reservoirs of surplus hydropower now wasting through turbines into the Pacific. It also helps make feasible the upgrading of three existing lines by a total of 1,400 megawatts more, thus increasing overall transfer capacity by some 3,000 megawatts between California and the Northwest.

California is helped by being able to purchase more of this electricity, avoiding the necessity for billions of dollars in new electrical generation costs. In fact, 98 percent of all the utilities, both public and investor owned, in the State are part of the agreement signed with the Department of Energy. This includes a number of water districts as well.

The Pacific Northwest and the Federal Treasury are both helped by increased power revenues. The amendment would provide that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission approve or disapprove the arrangement struck between the Department and the financing utilities for the construction and operation of the line, but it would have the FERC do so within 2 years. Thus the utilities and

their ratepayers, to finance their line, will have some certainty that the vital mutual agreements underpinning their participation will be allowed to continue once they receive the initial approval.

This amendment is satisfactory, I believe, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce. Language in the supplemental bill, as reported, which was objectionable to the Judiciary Committee will be removed as well.

In this context, I would certainly like to express my appreciation to the committee chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY], chairman of the Energy Subcommittee, and to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO], chairman of the Judiciary Committee, as well as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH], for their cooperative spirit and for the permission that they have given us to proceed in good faith on this particular provision. Following my amendment, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, will move a point of order striking from the bill the original language as reported.

The powers of the Pacific Northwest to establish power rates and transmission rates for access policies are unimpaired by this language and by this project. I know of no opposition to the amendment, which would help facilitate a project which would be of great value to the taxpayer, the ratepayer, and the environment, all at no cost to the Treasury.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I am more than happy to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT], who has been very helpful in this whole effort.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, I just want to commend the gentleman in the well, as well as my chairman, the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, for working this out.

This has benefits for two great regions of the west coast. For those in California and for those of us in the Pacific Northwest, it is extremely useful, and I want to commend the gentleman for all his hard work in putting this together.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I look forward to working with him as we complete this project.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is the amendment that was worked out through the Department of Energy and the State of California?

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, that is correct. The State Energy Commission was part and parcel of the effort, and the Department of Energy, with Secretary Harrington presiding in recent months, has been very helpful in bringing this together.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I just want to join him in support of this amendment. It is very important to our State and to the Nation.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will my distinguished friend, the gentleman from California, yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to an understanding reached with Mr. FAZIO and the leadership of the Committee on Appropriations, the amendment by Mr. FAZIO, together with a point of order that I will offer to the next two paragraphs, would delete from the bill broad legislative provisions relating to the Clayton Act and the Federal Power Act and substitute a much narrower provision and substitute a new provision which has been worked out with Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. RODINO.

The new provision eliminates any reference to the Clayton Act and exceptions for antitrust matters on the insistence of Chairman RODINO and myself. In the first sentence, it provides a time limitation on the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission [FERC] to exercise whatever jurisdiction or authority FERC now has under the Federal Power Act over a Department of Energy [DOE] Memorandum of Understanding dated December 19, 1984, as amended and supplemented by a DOE decision of February 7, 1985, and by DOE letters dated February 4, May 4, and May 20, 1985, within 2 years after enactment or 2 years after filing of each contract, whichever is later. The amendment does not endorse, reject, or approve the memorandum of related documents. It is neutral on these items. At the same time, the amendment includes, in the second sentence, a disclaimer that the entire amendment is not intended, and does not actually affect, change, or limit in any way or manner FERC's present authority, jurisdiction or procedures concerning rates, charges, service, facilities, classification, access or other matters however raised, in regard to this 500 kilovolt alternating current transmission line project in the far West.

The amendment also does not affect in any way any judicial review of any matter after FERC action.

In the third sentence, the amendment also notes the prior authorization of the project in 1984 and the requirement of compensation from non-Federal participants in the form of transmission capacity, monetary payment, or other fair equivalent benefit, with priority for capacity to be reserved for DOE laboratories and wildlife refuges.

In the fourth sentence, the amendment requires the DOE and FERC to keep the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House and the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources fully and currently informed about all of these matters.

Finally, the amendment includes a disclaimer regarding Bonneville Power Administration authorities and policies that is consistent with the DOE's February 4, 1985 letter to Senator HATFIELD which I just mentioned. It is a sentence urged by Mr. SWIFT and Mr. AUCOIN and I commend them for it.

Mr. Chairman, it is with great reluctance that I agree to even this narrow substitute provision. The Energy and Commerce Committee prefers no provision at all because we do not want matters within our jurisdiction legislated in appropriations bills. Further, there have been no hearings on such legislation. Several of the DOE documents are very recent and have not undergone public review. It is not at all clear why any provision is needed or desirable. However, because of the urging of my very able and effective friend and valuable Member of the House, Mr. FAZIO, and his assurance to me and Chairman RODINO that he will insist in any conference on H.R. 2577 that this provision will not be changed, even technically, or expanded, I have agreed to this limited provision. I and subcommittee Chairman MARKEY have also agreed that our committee is open to consider further legislative approaches, if needed, in the future and that our committee will, in its oversight function, examine this project and related matters carefully in the near future to ensure that DOE and all participants are complying with all applicable provisions of law and acting in good faith. I note that many in California and the Pacific Northwest believe this is an important project. I understand that the private participants who are seeking this legislation apparently agree. I expect all, including these participants, strive to make it work and come into completion and not seek excuses or raise real or imagined obstacles to its success.

I also want to thank my friend, Mr. SWIFT, also an effective and valuable Member of this body, for his role in helping to work out this difficult problem. Congressman MARKEY, who is chairman of the subcommittee with

responsibility for these matters, and who took the leadership in working out these matters, and I am grateful to both of these Members and Chairman WHITTEN and Chairman BEVILL for their efforts and understanding.

I commend my good friend and able chairman, Mr. RODINO, for his help and his joining me in preserving the House rules and our proper legislative jurisdiction. I also express my appreciation to Chairman PEPPER and the Rules Committee for supporting Chairman RODINO and Mr. MARKEY and myself.

Finally, I want to express my appreciation for Congressman BROYHILL and Congressman MOORHEAD of California for also helping to work out this matter.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] for his comments.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I am happy to yield to my friend, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I merely want to state that I have no objection to the amendment which the gentleman is presenting. The language has already been worked out in advance. I know that in no way will affect the antitrust laws. There will be no exemption that will be granted by this language.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for having cooperated in this matter in working out this language.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I want to sincerely thank the chairman of the committee for his cooperative spirit in bringing us to this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] wish to pursue his point of order?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order on the amendment, but I do have points of order on sections of the legislation commencing at line 20, page 39, and line 12, page 40.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan will withhold his point of order until the Chair has put the question on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my support to the amendment offered by my good friend Mr. FAZIO, and commend him for the work he has done to have this language accepted.

As has already been mentioned, the third alternating current intertie is extremely important both to the North-

west and Southwest regions of the country, and by implication to the rest of the Nation as well. By providing a conduit through which power can be moved from the Northwest, where it is surplus, to the Southwest, where it is needed, we are making the most efficient use of this Nation's natural resources. In addition, by making hydro-power available to the Southwest, we help avoid the need for power production from fossil fuels, lessening our dependence on the use of oil and improving the outlook for our environment.

The language before us today helps facilitate the progress of the third alternating current line. It does so by providing additional security to the participants by establishing a time-frame within which FERC must exercise its authority. At the same time, nothing in the bill or the memorandum of understanding regarding ownership interests in the new line in any way affects BPA's authorities, particularly with respect to wholesale power rates, transmission rates, or regulation of transmission access. The bill does not affect the authority of the Bonneville Power Administration to regulate access to federally owned or controlled transmission which has recently been upheld by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

In this context, Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman's amendment and look forward to its passage into law.

● Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from California for his efforts on behalf of the third alternating current intertie line, which this amendment facilitates. The line will greatly benefit both the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest regions, and will build upon an already existing network of interties previously approved by Congress in the Public Works Appropriation Act of 1964 and in section 8 of the Pacific Northwest Preference Act.

These laws gave us the present authorized transmission grid: The existing 500 kilo-volt direct current line between The Dalles, OR, and the Sylmar converter station in Los Angeles, CA; the second direct current line, a 750 kilo-volt line authorized for construction by the Federal Government between The Dalles, OR, and Hoover Dam but not yet built; and the existing 500 kilo-volt alternating current lines between John Day, OR, and Los Angeles.

The third alternating current line, initially approved by Congress last year and further facilitated by this amendment, increases the capacity of the existing intertie to 4,800 megawatt. This additional capacity, as those of us in the Pacific Northwest and Pacific Southwest are well aware, is needed to sell and exchange electric power to the advantage of ratepayers in both regions.

This additional capacity permits the sale of Northwest electric power for which there is no market in the Northwest at rates established for such power. This power can be used to displace the consumption of expensive fossil fuels in the Southwest. This was among the initial justifications for the intertie. The rationale is as sound today as it was in 1964. The benefits to both of our regions—and the opportunities for additional long-term power sales—are significant.

It is my hope that this amendment and the report language will increase the likelihood of these sales by allowing construction of the intertie to go forward while protecting the interests of the Northwest and the Northwest ratepayers.

It's my understanding that nothing in this amendment or the memorandum of understanding regarding ownership interests in the new line in any way affects BPA's authorities, particularly with respect to wholesale power rates, transmission rates or regulation of transmission access. It does not affect the authority of the BPA to regulate access to Federally owned or controlled transmission which has recently been upheld by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Similar assurances were offered to Senator HATFIELD by the former Energy Secretary, Don Hodel in an exchange of letters earlier this year. Report language in this bill also refers to the Energy Secretary's February 4, 1985 written assurances to Congress. I would like to submit for the record copies of Senator HATFIELD's letter of January 3, 1985 inquiring about the BPA authorities and the Secretary's February 4, 1985 reply.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC, January 31, 1985.

Hon. DONALD PAUL HODEL,
Secretary of Energy, Department of Energy,
Washington, DC.

DEAR DON: On December 24, 1985, you forwarded to Congress a draft Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) negotiated by major California utilities that intend to participate in the construction of the third AC Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie line.

I want to congratulate you and the Department of Energy on your efforts in facilitating this agreement which represents a tremendous opportunity for both regions. Significant mutual benefits from increase of intertie capacity will be forthcoming, and all participants may look forward to sharing in these benefits. However, it is important to emphasize that Pacific Southwest utilities are not forced to purchase and Pacific Northwest utilities are not forced to sell resources against their interest. While regional interdependence is facilitated, regional interdependence is also assured.

On this latter point, I have had numerous inquiries seeking assurance that the MOU and related discussions are to be interpreted in a manner consistent with BPA's existing authorities and policies respecting rates and access to the Intertie, including Canadian access. This would appear to be the intent

of the MOU. As you are aware, many members of Congress are on record as supporting the adoption and implementation of BPA's near-term Intertie Access Policy. I would appreciate the Department's further assurance that my interpretation of the MOU is correct and that it in no way is to be interpreted as impinging on these authorities and policies.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

MARK O. HATFIELD,
Chairman.

—
THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY,
Washington, DC, February 4, 1985.

Hon. MARK O. HATFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MARK: Thank you for your kind letter of February 1, 1985, regarding the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on the third 500 kV AC line, which Congress authorized in Title III of the Energy and Water Development Appropriation Act for Fiscal Year 1985. I agree that it provides a landmark opportunity for interregional cooperation and that significant mutual benefits can accrue to both the Pacific Southwest (PSW) and the Pacific Northwest (PNW).

Your interpretation of the MOU is the same as ours. The Department of Energy's understanding in reviewing and forwarding the draft MOU to Congress was that each region, the PSW and the PNW respectively, must decide the sales or purchases that is in their own best interest. Further, the MOU should not be read as impinging upon the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) authorities and policies respecting rates and intertie access.

With respect to extraregional access, the BPA's near term Intertie Access Policy provides access to Canadian utilities when capacity is not otherwise subscribed by PNW utilities. I understand that BPA has offered and continues to discuss the possibility of greater access if agreement by extraregional utilities can be reached on improved coordination between the Canadian and PNW power systems. * * *

The Department is also aware that the proper level and design of BPA rates for sales of non-firm power to PSW utilities are currently the subject of a proceeding at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. It is not our intent that the MOU should affect or be affected by the outcome of that proceeding.

I trust that this clarifies the Department's understanding with regard to the MOU and the issues you raised.

Sincerely,

DONALD PAUL HODEL.●

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this section be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill, beginning at line 19, page 39, through line 11, page 40, is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The Congress finds that the timely construction, operation, and use of a third 500 kV AC transmission line between the Pacific Northwest and California in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding for the California-Oregon Transmission Project dated December 19, 1984, as approved and conditioned by the Secretary of Energy's Memorandum of Decision dated February 7, 1985, and by the Secretary's letter to the Chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water dated May 20, 1985, and a May 4, 1985 letter from the Energy Department Acting General Counsel (the "Memorandum"), will be of significant benefit to both regions and is just and reasonable and in the public interest. However, neither this Act nor the Memorandum shall in any way affect the authorities or policies of the Bonneville Power Administration regarding wholesale power rates, transmission rates, or transmission access.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is now recognized for his point of order.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order to the language of the bill at line 20, page 39, through line 11 on page 40.

I would raise a point of order also, Mr. Chairman, if I am recognized for that purpose, to the section at line 12, page 40, through line 24, if I could do that by unanimous consent at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that that part has not been read. The gentleman will be recognized at the appropriate time.

Mr. DINGELL. I stand on my original point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. DINGELL. The point of order, Mr. Chairman, is that the language referred to is violative of the provisions of clause 2, rule XXI, of the Rules of the House of Representatives as legislation in an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member desire to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The point of order is well taken, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read the next paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sections 4, 4C, and 16 of the Clayton Act, as amended (38 Stat. 730), shall not apply to the Memorandum. Furthermore, there shall be no modification under the Federal Power Act, as amended (40 Stat. 1063), of the Memorandum or of mutually agreed upon contractual provisions which implement the Memorandum, to the extent that the provisions are derived from the Memorandum. To the extent that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has jurisdiction over contracts containing such contractual provisions, it may determine whether the provisions implement the Memorandum. Except as specifically provided in this Act, no other rights shall be affected under the antitrust laws, the federal Power Act, or any other law.

POINTS OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] rise?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I raise the same point of order to the language of the section at lines 12 through 24 on page 40 in that said language does constitute legislation on an appropriation bill and is, therefore, violative of clause 2 or rule XXI.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the matter has already been raised by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the chairman of the committee, but I was prepared to raise that point of order and will raise the point of order against that part of the paragraph on page 40, lines 12 through 24.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair notes that the gentleman raises the same point of order.

Does any other Member care to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair sustains the point of order, and that paragraph will be stricken.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the people of Holcut, MS, and many others reared there have shown a greatness in cooperating with the Corps of Engineers and our Government in the development of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. They have given up their town, Holcut, a historic community, to this progress. The town of Holcut, MS, was the only town to be displaced by the waterway.

To them we express our admiration. Truly, the citizens of Holcut are like those who have made such contributions throughout history; they revere the past but are willing to build on it.

In order to honor the citizens of Holcut and to honor the history of the town, the Corps of Engineers should develop from funds available a suitable plaque and marker to provide recognition for this historical site of Holcut.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the paragraph at the top of page 41.

The Clerk read as follows:

The line constructed pursuant to the Memorandum is hereby named "The Harold T. (Blizz) Johnson California-Pacific Northwest Intertie line".

□ 1350

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER V

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE FUNDS
APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS
CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL BANK
FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

For payment to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development by the Secretary of the Treasury, for the United States share of the paid-in portion of the increased capital stock, as authorized by the International Financial Institutions Act, \$30,000,925 for the General Capital Increase, as authorized by section 39 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, to remain available until expended.

LIMITATION OF CALLABLE CAPITAL
SUBSCRIPTION

The United States Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development may subscribe without fiscal year limitation to the callable portion of the United States share of increases in capital stock in an amount not to exceed \$370,023,735.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTER-AMERICAN
DEVELOPMENT BANK

For payment to the Inter-American Development Bank by the Secretary of the Treasury for the United States share of the replenishment of the resources if the Fund for Special Operations, \$72,500,000 to remain available until expended; \$3,000,000 for the United States share of the capital for the Inter-American Investment Corporation to remain available until expended; and \$40,001,171 for the United States share of the increase in paid-in capital stock of the bank to remain available until expended.

LIMITATION OF CALLABLE CAPITAL
SUBSCRIPTION

The United States Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank may subscribe without fiscal year limitation to the callable capital portion of the United States share of such increase in capital stock in an amount not to exceed \$849,000,244.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT
BANK

For payment to the Asian Development Bank by the Secretary of the Treasury for the United States contribution to the increase in resources of the Asian Development Fund, \$91,232,340 to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS
(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "International Organizations and Programs", \$5,686,000 to be derived by transfer from the "Economic Support Fund" for Lebanon as provided in Public Law 98-63: *Provided*, That these funds shall be available only for the International Atomic Energy Agency.

BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
POPULATION, DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

The Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations Act of 1985, as enacted in Public Law 98-473, is amended by adding at the end of the paragraph entitled "Population, Development Assistance":

None of the funds made available in this bill nor any unobligated balances from prior appropriations may be made available to any organization or program which sup-

ports or participates in the management of a program of coercive abortion.

PAYMENT TO THE FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For an additional amount for "Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund", \$1,302,000.

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

For an additional amount for the "Economic Support Fund", \$2,008,000,000: *Provided*, That of the funds provided by this paragraph \$1,500,000,000 shall be available for Israel; \$500,000,000 shall be available for Egypt; and \$8,000,000 shall be available for the Middle East Regional Program: *Provided further*, That the funds provided by this paragraph shall not exceed the amount contained in an official supplemental budget request transmitted to the Congress: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided by this paragraph shall be available until they have been authorized: *Provided further*, That the funds provided by this paragraph shall be available for obligation until September 30, 1986.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF COLORADO

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Colorado: On page 44, line 3, strike "\$2,008,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,508,000,000"; and on line 5, strike "\$500,000,000 shall be available for Egypt."

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, we meet in troubled times. We meet at a time when we have a deficit this year that will exceed \$200 billion. Some estimates run as high as \$215 billion. Others think it may go even higher. We are not unaware of this crisis. As a Congress, we have met and begun to take strong action. We recognize that the future economic strength of this Nation lies in our ability to bring some balance to our economy.

This body has chosen to freeze the authorizations for NASA—not an easy act. We voted to freeze the funding for NSF. We voted to freeze the authorization for the Bureau of Standards. We voted to freeze a variety of other programs.

There are proposals by many Members of this body to push for an across-the-board freeze.

The Senate of the United States has suggested a freeze in COLA's.

This body has acted to freeze, or at least suggest in the budget document, to freeze pay raises for Federal employees.

At the time we are doing this, we have in this supplemental a \$500 million increase in funding for Egypt.

Now, let me make it very clear. I bear no animosity for the country of Egypt, but they have already received \$2.2 billion and what this body is proposing to do in this supplemental, is to give Egypt a \$500 million increase over the \$2.2 billion it already receives, while we freeze Federal employees' salaries and we freeze NASA and we freeze a variety of other agencies.

Mr. Chairman, that is indefensible. We cannot turn to our own people and freeze their funds and pay and have an enormous increase for Egypt.

It is not a matter of liking or disliking Egypt. It is a matter of bringing some fiscal sanity to this country's economy and to this country's budget.

Let me suggest that this amendment simply removes the \$500 million year-end bonus. It does not cut the amount of aid Egypt receives.

We do not have the resources for an enormous bonus to Egypt. I am not sure we have the resources for the \$2.2 billion that we are already giving.

Let us make one point very clear. Aid to Israel and aid to Egypt are not tied together. We are not obligated to fund Egypt at the same rate we fund Israel. Not increasing the aid to Egypt does not imperil our assistance to the State of Israel.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I will be glad to yield as soon as I finish two other points, if the gentleman would permit me.

We are talking about in this supplemental a \$500 million bonus to Egypt. The fact is, they have been unable to even spend the money we have already given. There is \$2.1 billion in aid unspent at this point. Imagine another domestic program where you had not even been able to spend the money you had already received and you were trying to push another \$500 million on them.

Next, I think it is important for us to look at our history. The Camp David accords do not specify that there be a parity between the aid to Israel and Egypt. Egypt has already received \$12 billion since 1978. No one, no one could possibly accuse the United States of being stingy in this area.

The fact is Egypt has failed to maintain an ambassador to the State of Israel. If we give them a bonus at a time they have failed to live up to the Camp David accords, we are saying they do not have to. We are rewarding them for failing to live up to those accords.

Our activity by providing a bonus says that we do not care whether they live up to those accords or not. I know our rhetoric is to the other point, but the fact is when it comes down to it, we will have provided them a bonus for failing to live up to their agreement.

There are other items with regard to trade and tourism agreements that have come out of the Camp David Accords that have not been honored. Egypt has refused to let the U.S. Rapid Deployment Force use the Red Sea ports on a regular basis.

In the United Nations, Egypt, that receives \$2.2 billion a year from us, has voted against the U.S. position 76.6 percent of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROWN] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. RUDD, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BROWN of Colorado was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I know there are some folks here who would like to address an inquiry.

I would merely close with this. It is inappropriate at a time of fiscal crisis for us to provide \$500 million bonus to Egypt.

It is inappropriate for us to reward a country that has voted against us 76 percent of the time.

It is inappropriate for us to provide a bonus for a country that has failed to live up to the Camp David accords. And to provide that \$500 million bonus at this time sends a message that we do not care whether they live up to their agreement or not.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for bringing these facts supporting his amendment and I support that amendment.

Would the gentleman answer one question, please?

Does the gentleman know how much funding we have given to Egypt since the Camp David accords?

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. The figures that I have seen indicates that they have received \$12 billion since 1978.

Mr. RUDD. The gentleman was indicating that Israel has received \$12 billion, but Egypt, is that what the gentleman had in mind for them, \$12 billion?

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Yes. Israel has received well above that figure.

Mr. RUDD. I thank the gentleman. I think that these facts bear supporting of the amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the clarification.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think anyone needs to be reminded that the bill we are talking about here today does contain \$1.5 billion for the State of Israel.

I strongly oppose the Brown amendment to delete \$500 million in supplemental economic assistance for Egypt. These funds are essential to that country and we have to support the economic needs of our friend and supporter in the Middle East.

The \$500 million in this bill is there as the result of a careful review by the administration of the economic needs

of Egypt and the serious economic crisis that country faces.

The administration has recognized serious problems resulting from Egypt's heavily subsidized economy, but more importantly, has recognized the strong efforts of the Mubarak government in Egypt to reform that economy and to set it on a more solid footing.

□ 1400

A strong Egyptian economy is crucial to U.S. interests in the Middle East because a strong economy will promote stability and moderation. And I would suggest that lack of stability and immoderation are the real dangers and the real enemies of peace in the Middle East.

Egypt is a pivotal nation in the region and the United States must meet its needs at the present time. Egypt is seeking to reform its economy, reducing subsidies, and state intervention, and opening the economy to more private sector activity and a more market oriented atmosphere.

The United States strongly supports this action. In fact, this Congress has often chided Egypt and pressed the administration to open up the Egyptian economy, and these funds are needed to support that very effort.

It is important to recognize, I think, the way these funds are being provided to Egypt. They are not being given to Egypt in a lump sum without consideration of the results. The committee has provided these funds with the understanding that they will be dispersed over a 2-year period in fiscal year 1985 and fiscal year 1986 in increments which are based on Egypt's achievements of continuing economic reforms.

It is in the interests of the United States that Egypt reform its economy and remain economically strong, and these funds are to be provided to Egypt only with the understanding that Egypt does precisely that.

It is clear to all of us here in the House I think that we must cut spending back to the bare minimum and cannot fund unnecessary programs. But I believe very strongly this is a necessary program and that these funds are important to the economy of a strong friend and ally of the United States, and I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Our efforts at reducing the U.S. budget deficit cannot override our national security interests. A strong and stable Egyptian economy with these funds will clearly promote the national security interests of the United States.

I would suggest that the passage of this amendment will send a different kind of message than the one my good friend from Colorado [Mr. Brown] has suggested, and that is that what is being said in the Middle East all of the

time will be proven in the eyes of many there to be true; namely, that we only have one friend in the Middle East, that we do not have a balanced and evenhanded policy. And I am afraid that passage, as I say, of the gentleman's amendment will be read by many in the area as evidence of that feeling they already have.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just raise a question. We, of course, supply Egypt \$2.2 billion a year now and that is continued.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Is it the gentleman's feeling that the \$2.2 billion is not enough to get them to adopt the reforms that he has talked about? If they would not adopt the reforms with \$2.2 billion a year, why would they adopt them with another \$500 million bonus?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Certainly the feeling of the administration, who has studied this very carefully, is that this is required to continue the economic recovery in that country. But I think the strongest argument for my position, and against the gentleman's, is the psychological one, frankly, of the message it would send and the damage that it would do or could do, hopefully would not do, but could do to the peace process, which, while it is not at an advanced stage, we might say at least there is a glimmering of hope. That is probably the best way to put it. There is progress, there is movement.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Does the gentleman from California share my concern that this appears to be rewarding Egypt at a time that they have failed to live up to the Camp David accords?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. That is one interpretation that could be made. But I am afraid that the other interpretation, the one that I suggested, is the one more likely to be made, not only by Egypt but by our other friends in the area.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise to oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as those in the Chamber who know me are very well aware, there are many issues upon which I disagree with the administration. I disagree with them fundamentally on South Africa. I disagree very strongly with their position on Nicaragua.

But if there is one area where I think this administration is doing a good job it is in the area of the Middle East. And I think we ought to fully understand what this amendment would put at risk.

I share the concerns expressed by the gentleman from Colorado about the need for fiscal stringency, and I would be curious when the regular appropriation bill comes to the floor how many people will at that point back up what the Chair intends to do in producing a very lean regular appropriation bill, because it is the intention of this subcommittee chairman to make a number of significant reductions below the administration's request.

But at this point I think we need to understand why we have a special case. The administration asked the Congress to do two things. They asked the Congress to approve a \$1,500,000,000 special supplemental to Israel in order to provide transition assistance to enable it to attack some of its very serious economic problems; and at the same time the administration asked the Congress to also approve \$500 million as a companion item in additional assistance to Egypt.

The easy thing for the administration to do in the case of Israel, because Israel is a very close ally and friend, the easy thing for the administration to do would have simply been to say, "OK, we will give you the money, no ifs, ands, or buts." The administration did not do that. The administration, instead, appointed Dr. Herb Stein, Dr. Fischer, and several others as part of an economic panel to review what actually needed to be done to assure that this additional assistance to Israel would not become a permanent add-on to the budget. They wanted to assure that this would be a one time, temporary request to get them over the hurdle.

And so they asked the Congress—and we complied—to make this money available in a way which would give the administration the authority to determine the schedule under which it would actually be provided to Israel, so that they would be able to try to maintain, frankly, some friendly pressure on the Israeli Government to meet the economic reforms that are necessary.

The committee chose to do that same thing for Egypt. We chose to also give the administration the authority to determine the timing of the granting of this additional economic assistance in order to put some friendly pressure on the Egyptian Government to try to follow through on some of the reforms that are necessary to assure that this is not going to be a permanent addition.

I have great doubts personally that either Egypt or Israel will actually take the steps necessary to actually get their economic problems under control. I think that is an open question. But the subcommittee has tried to march down the same road with the administration. We wanted no seams to develop between us and the admin-

istration to make clear to both countries that we are trying to approach this in a unified way.

Make no mistake about it, on the subject raised by the gentleman from California, this is not just an economic issue. There is not one partner to Camp David; there are two parties to the Camp David accords.

In my judgment the best single way that we can assure that Camp David never moves beyond its existing status, to bring in other parties to the peace process, is to pass this amendment today. To pass this amendment today would send a clear message that there is absolutely no reason for moderation on the part of any Arab country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. OBEY was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. OBEY. To pass this amendment would send a clear message that there are no rewards for trying to cooperate in the peace process. To pass this amendment today would send a clear signal to Syria, and to Mr. Arafat, and to the Saudis and a number of other parties that there is really no need to be responsible, and there is no need to look for peace.

I think it would be greatly discouraging to the efforts the administration is engaged in now to bring the Israelis and the Jordanians and the Egyptians all together in a second stage of Camp David.

The committee conducted an on-site review of both the Israeli requests and the Egyptian requests over the spring break.

□ 1410

I think anyone who was on that journey knows that the committee pressed both governments extremely hard in terms of the needed economic reform that is essential to prevent this from being a permanent increase in appropriation. I just think that it is absolutely essential that the Congress and administration remain united on this one because the administration is doing as good a job as can be done in this area under the circumstances, and we owe them, because of the quality of their work in this area, we owe them our support.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GREEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to support the gentleman in his efforts to defeat this amendment. I think that probably no member of the Appropriations Committee has spoken out more last year and the year before on the problems of Egyptian noncompliance with the Camp David agreements and the possi-

bility that if that situation continued to deteriorate we ought to be looking at the foreign aid for the Egyptian Government. But the fact of the matter is that the situation has not only not deteriorated but, in my opinion, has somewhat improved—although certainly not 100 percent—from where we were when we considered last year's foreign aid bill in the Appropriations Committee.

I therefore join the chairman of the subcommittee in suggesting that this would be an extremely poor time in which to try to decouple these two aid programs. They both flow inevitably from the Camp David agreements. There is no doubt that President Sadat, when he entered into the Camp David agreements, did so in part to improve the economic well-being of his Egyptian citizenry. That is the reason he was willing to reduce the level of tension in the Mideast because he could see what that was doing to the Egyptian economy and the Egyptian people.

So I think, given the modest turnaround in the performance of the Egyptian Government under the Camp David agreements, and the discussions of the Mideast at this point, this would be a very bad time in which to support this amendment.

(On request of Mr. RUDD and by unanimous consent, Mr. OBEY was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. OBEY. I surely do yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RUDD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I respect the gentleman's careful legislative workmanship, having served with him on the Committee on Appropriations, but I am a little concerned about this one aspect that has nothing to do with the Camp David accords, in my opinion. We have \$2.1 billion in the pipeline for Egypt unspent and yet to provide an additional \$200 million disturbs me greatly in view of the fact of the size of our own debt and deficit which tells me we do not have that kind of money to provide.

How does the gentleman feel about that?

Mr. OBEY. Let me be very frank about it. My honest feelings on the subject are that if this issue is so important that we ought to fund it, then we ought to raise the taxes to pay for it, rather than borrow the money. That is my honest personal view. Nonetheless, I am trying to cooperate with the administration in this instance, because they have an important foreign policy goal. I would also point out that it is giving the wrong impression to suggest that there is somehow free money laying around here. The money to which the gentle-

man refers is earmarked for projects which have not yet been completed. That money is under obligation.

Mr. RUDD. I thank the gentleman. It does not make sense to me.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I have great regard for our colleague from Colorado. He makes eminent good sense in many areas. But it does not make any sense at this point in the history of the Middle East to disrupt what the chairman has pointed out is a very fragile relationship, between ourselves and the Camp David nations, that is, Israel and Egypt. It is particularly unfortunate timing from the standpoint of their economic history. Both Israel and Egypt have very severe balance-of-payment problems. To disrupt this package, which appropriates \$1.5 billion for Israel and \$500 million for Egypt, means that almost all of the money in the supplemental goes to Israel, one partner in the Camp David accords and nothing to Egypt. The other partner. It would be, as Mr. OBEY said, a terrible signal to those moderate governments in the Middle East whom we want to join with us in what the chairman has called Camp David II. I think that the Camp David agreement is the linchpin of peace in the Middle East, if there is to be peace in the Middle East, and we would like to bring Jordan as well as the other responsible nations, into this step-by-step peace process. Egypt has been a very positive force behind the whole peace process. Have they lived up to all the Camp David accords? The answer is no. As the gentleman from New York pointed out, many of us have been critical regarding those elements of Camp David that have not been observed. But Egypt has been a stabilizing influence in the Middle East at a time of great tension. Our support for Egypt is especially important at a time when the United States is very anxious to bring Jordan and other responsible Arab nations into this process that is so critical to the future of the Middle East.

I would suggest to the gentleman that the amendment is poorly timed; and it risks jeopardizing support for additional assistance to Israel. Many of us think this is a very critical moment in the history of the State of Israel. The Israelis need economic assistance and our support in moving the peace process forward. Egypt is also suffering from economic problems, perhaps to a greater degree than Israel. My fear is that passage of this amendment would fracture the relationship between the United States, Israel and Egypt. For this reason, I think the amendment should be defeated.

The gentleman talks about a signal. I would say to my good friend from Colorado, who knows the regard within which I hold him, that this

amendment would be a terrible signal. Supplemental aid for Egypt does not constitute a reward for pulling their Ambassador back from Tel Aviv. It is a response to legitimate economic needs. If these funds are denied, we would really be punishing one of the partners whose support is so critical to bring other Arab States into the step-by-step peace process which began at Camp David under President Carter and, hopefully, will go forward under this President. Peace in the Middle East is in the interest of both sides of the political aisle, of Israel, and of the Arab States. I cannot speak for the State of Israel, but it is my own view on this subject that the Israeli Government, both Likud and Labor, would be very much opposed to this amendment because it does introduce an element of inconsistency into a relationship that is not only fragile but the very key to the future peace prospects in the Middle East.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEMP. Yes, I would be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the position of the Israeli Government, I have not talked with them.

Mr. KEMP. I made it very clear that I am only speaking for myself. I am just surmising that they would oppose it if not publicly, then privately.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Our office did check with the Embassy and they do not have a position on the amendment.

Mr. KEMP. And I can understand why. I think Israel is wise in not taking a public position on this amendment either for or against. I am just telling you as someone who is responsible in this subcommittee, along with Mr. OBEY from Wisconsin, for trying to hammer out a bipartisan aid package that will move those nations forward toward peace in the Middle East, that I think it is poorly timed. It would be a very bad signal to our friends in the Middle East. And very importantly, it would be a very bad signal to Qadhafi. Clearly, Egypt, bordered by Libya and confronted by the breakdown of the Sudanese Government, is a vital strategic ally for the free world, in the Mideast and North Africa; and I do not think Mr. Mubarak, or Mr. Peres, or the President, any one of them would think the passage of this amendment would be helpful to the peace process in the Middle East.

□ 1420

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. If the gentleman would yield further.

Mr. KEMP. Of course I will.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. We have been told Richard Murphy, the Asst-

ant Secretary of State for the Near East had said, quote:

The U.S. has made no commitment for equality of aid.

The gentleman had referred to the concern for a symmetry between aid to Israel and aid to Egypt. At least our research has shown that there is no commitment in that area, or obligation.

(On request of Mr. OBEY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KEMP was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. KEMP. I thank my colleague from Wisconsin. Before I yield to him, I want to say that while I believe there is no commitment to numerical equality of aid, certainly it is in the spirit of the peace process to aid both Israel and Egypt, while both took great risks for peace. Part of this \$1.5 billion is to help Israel deal, not only with the pullout from Lebanon, but with the pullout from the Sinai and the other terrible costs that have been incurred by that nation. In judging the need for aid to Egypt, let us remember that there is a very severe economic problem, in Egypt and in other Northern African countries as well, and that Egypt is so critical to the strategic interests of this country and also the peace process. On that basis, I support the President's \$500 million request for Egypt.

Why is not the gentleman striking, in the spirit of fiscal responsibility that he mentioned earlier, the aid for Israel? He is not doing it because clearly he is pro-Israel. I think it is important, if you are pro-Israel, to recognize that it is incredibly important to Israel to have Egypt and other moderate Arab Nations involved in the peace process, not outside of it. It is also important to be strong, not weak, in our dealings with Qadhafi and other anti-Western forces in the region and I think the gentleman's amendment would send them the wrong signal.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, our chairman.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would just like to read a portion of a letter which I received from Kenneth W. Dam, who at the time he wrote this letter was Acting Secretary of State, and he said in part:

The actual amounts requested for each country were based on our best projection of the assistance required to facilitate orderly economic adjustment. As a full partner in the peace process, we cannot address only one partner's problem without losing the confidence of others in the region whose active participation is essential to further progress.

And then he goes on to say after describing the discussions underway now; he goes on to say:

Proposals to reduce or eliminate the supplemental assistance Egypt needs could only have an adverse impact on this important and constructive dialog.

I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. KEMP. I thank my chairman for yielding.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. KEMP was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. KEMP. I think this amendment would have an adverse impact upon Israel. I do not see how we can sustain continuing support of material resources to Israel, absent some aid to Egypt, a country that catalyzed the peace process. That is not to endorse all of the mistakes that the Egyptians have made, but denying aid to this country would be a terrible message to send to friends of the peace process in the Middle East at this very critical point.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEMP. My colleague from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I agree with the gentleman. I oppose the Brown amendment for the reasons that he has explained and for the reasons that the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from New York have already given in their statements to the House.

(On request of Mr. YATES and by unanimous consent, Mr. KEMP was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will continue to yield, it seems to me that this is a critical period, not only for Camp David and for the true signatories together with us to the Camp David Treaty, but negotiations are going on with other countries such as Jordan in an effort to try to expand the purposes of Camp David and to bring other signatories into Camp David.

It would seem to me that, if this amendment were approved, it would set back that peace process tremendously and present the culmination or the successful culmination of the administration's efforts.

We, on our subcommittee, have criticized Egypt for its failure to observe the spirit and the intent and the letter of the Camp David Treaty. We have written paragraphs in our report urging Egypt to change and adopt a greater spirit of cooperation with Israel and we are frustrated by that.

I can understand the gentleman's frustration with Egypt's actions and its failure to cooperate to a much greater extent, but I do not think this is the way. I do not think the gentleman's amendment is the way to achieve what I think the gentleman wants to achieve.

The amendment should be defeated.

Mr. KEMP. I thank my colleague from Illinois.

I just want to finish by saying that I, too, recognize the sincerity of the gentleman from Colorado, but do not forget the sincerity of Egypt in coop-

erating last summer with the United States in clearing the mines from the Red Sea and the Gulf of Suez canal. This assistance was critical in defending U.S. strategic interests in the Middle East and the Mediterranean. As I have noted before, I would suggest that accepting this amendment would not only be untimely, but might very well fracture those fragile hopes for peace that are served by encouraging Egypt and Israel to continue the process begun at Camp David, and to bring other responsible Arab nations into the process.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, before I speak on the amendment, I want to take this opportunity to commend and congratulate my good friend of many years, the new chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, Mr. OBEY. He did an exemplary job; we had a very difficult job in the subcommittee on the International Financial Institutions. He put together a real good package which I supported, and incidentally, DAVID, I am very happy to note that today it went through on a voice vote.

He has been a good chairman in his first year at the helm, and I know he is going to be a great chairman of that subcommittee. DAVE, it is a pleasure to work with you.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment eliminating the supplemental economic assistance for Egypt.

The President requested this \$500 million in emergency assistance to Egypt as an integral part of the entire package of timely, negotiated aid to the Middle East. Two other parts of this package, \$1.5 million for Israel and \$8 million for West Bank and Gaza residents, were also requested and have been included in the bill. Based on the recent visit to the United States of King Hussein of Jordan, it is expected that a request for Jordan in the neighborhood of \$200 million to \$300 million will also be forthcoming from the administration—perhaps to be added to this bill by the Senate.

Let's not kid ourselves. Part of the rationale for this aid is economic, but the larger reason is political. The United States has a large stake in promoting the continuation and expansion of the Camp David peace process in the Middle East. The United States has a large stake in the stability of Egypt. The United States must continue to play an evenhanded role when dealing with our diverse friends in that region.

We find ourselves again at a very critical juncture in the Middle East. While new players have indicated a willingness to discuss peace, new and continuing uncertainties in Lebanon and the Sudan threaten to undermine

that progress. This is definitely not the time to furnish a large amount of aid to one side while ignoring the legitimate needs of the other.

We must support the serious efforts undertaken recently by both Israel and Egypt to improve their bilateral relationship. Knocking out this aid to Egypt would have an adverse impact on this important and constructive dialog.

The sponsor of this amendment says we shouldn't send any more aid to Egypt because there is still money in the pipeline. Sure, there is money there, although that pipeline has been getting smaller over the past couple of years as projects become implemented. But those funds in the pipeline are already programmed for specific purposes. This additional aid is intended to meet unexpected financial and balance of payments emergencies due to lower oil prices and remittances from Egyptians working abroad. This aid will be disbursed as a cash transfer in tranches by the President as Egypt improves its economic performance.

This is intended as a one-shot balance of payments boost to assist the Egyptian Government to take the tough economic policy reform measures necessary to put their economy on a sustainable basis.

Of course, Egypt has had problems implementing some assistance projects in the past. They are trying to support 45 million people largely on the resources of a narrow strip of land along the Nile River. They have had thousands of years to build up a bureaucracy, compared to our 200 years. They know they have problems, and President Mubarak has been trying, with considerable political courage, to address those problems. But he needs our help.

Don't cut his political and economic legs out from under him. It is the interests of all concerned—the United States, Israel, Egypt, and the entire region—that we continue to play an evenhanded role in the Middle East.

Vote against this amendment.

□ 1430

I yield to my good friend, and I mean good friend—the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. As one from the West, it is good to hear of his strong support for water projects, even if they are in Egypt.

I would say to the gentleman that the information I have been given indicates that rather than the pipeline narrowing—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] has expired.

(On request of Mr. BROWN of Colorado and by unanimous consent, Mr. CONTE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. The information I have been given indicated that instead of the pipeline getting smaller, it is increasing. Egypt has received \$1.6 billion in 1981, \$1.9 billion in 1982, \$2.3 billion in 1983, so that what we are dealing with here is not a shrinking pipeline but an increasing pipeline. Is that information correct?

Mr. CONTE. No. The annual aid levels are rising, but the pipeline is lower. What you have to realize is that a lot of that pipeline is already committed. Even though the pipeline is there, those funds are committed for development projects. That is why it is shrinking; it is getting smaller.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for us to examine the rationale that has been given by so many of those who oppose this amendment. I think that the gentleman from Colorado has some noble motives in mind when he offers this amendment, but the reality is that there is a time in this country always, during any budget process, when we have to weigh the political value of the money we spend against the value of the money itself.

In this particular case, the United States has invested, over the years, tremendous amounts of dollars, but, in addition, in the Middle East, has invested tremendous amounts of its political assets, its political courage and its manpower. Nobody can forget just a little under 2 years ago what happened to almost 250 of our marines in the Middle East, in Lebanon. We have an investment there, and what we are trying to do is to bring slowly but surely the babe of peace, this infant, to nurturing, to maturity.

We are right now seeing a process which slowly, humbly, sometimes even imperceptibly, is moving forward, and that is an important sign.

The Camp David process that started in 1977 was an unusual process because we saw for the first time an Arab State willing to have the courage sufficient to stand up and make peace with Israel, its neighbor.

The United States pledged at that time and has fulfilled that pledge to be part of the ongoing process of using that as the first step to get peace in the Middle East. We have continued our strong secure relationship with Israel and have now gotten a strong secure relationship with Egypt. And, remember, Egypt had been originally very much in the camp of the Soviet Union, was buying arms, getting material aid and money from the Soviet Union; they have now turned away

and they have rejected the Soviet Union and they have thrown the Russian advisers out of Egypt and have much more come to our side.

In addition, in recent months they have been the strength which has allowed Jordan to renew diplomatic ties with Egypt, to bring other Arab countries closer, Iraq renewing ties with the United States, movement that is toward our side, movement that 2 years ago, when that terrible tragedy happened in Lebanon, people said would not occur: That the United States had lost all its influence; they wrung their hands and said we are finished in the Middle East. Oh, we were, for about 2 weeks. The reality is that, given their own devices, they must move in this direction, because the other direction is an alternative they do not want to contemplate.

We must now play that as well as we can. This \$500 million appropriation as a supplemental for their economic problems in Egypt is one way to do that. It is needed. It is not just a gift. This is a very important loan of money to these people for the purpose of having a very strong economy which helps us to secure peace in the region. And they have been a good friend.

Let me tell you what it does. It turns around a policy that we have had in this country, especially in the State Department, for too many years. That is the carrot and stick approach. We given them all the carrots they want, and then we beat ourselves over the head with the stick. We have for years been giving favors in advance of actual deeds being done. But in the case of Egypt, it was not promises; it was delivery. They followed through on Camp David. They provided an impetus for us. It cost their leader his life, but he had the courage to do it, and they have followed through.

I would urge my colleagues not to vote this amendment up. It has a chilling effect on what the United States has tried to do.

And let me just close by saying this: We right now should never be lulled by voting against this amendment into believing that this Congress subscribes to—and I want to make it clear my opposition to—the actions of Egypt lately with reference to Camp David. They should be warned. This Congress is on record, and I delivered a letter signed by many in this Chamber to Mr. Mubarak when he was here just 2 months ago, signed by over 100 of our colleagues, saying, "Send the ambassador back to Israel, commit yourself fully to Camp David." This money is no reward for their noncompliance. It is a recognition that we have a continuing strong relationship with them and also that we will not abandon our friends but we want our friends to commit themselves to what on paper they have agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of Florida was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. SMITH of Florida. And I want to urge my colleagues to understand that voting this amendment down gives no carte blanche for Egypt. They still must commit themselves fully to the Camp David process, and that means day-to-day commitment with Camp David.

But this amendment is the wrong way to try and get compliance by Egypt with the Camp David process. I urge my colleagues to review this whole area in the light of what the United States has done and to understand that this is for the peace process.

I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS].

Mr. WEISS. I thank my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Florida, for yielding to me, and I want to associate myself with his remarks and especially to underscore the last comments that the gentleman made.

It seems to me that the problem with this amendment is that the timing is totally out of sync. Had an amendment of this kind been offered 6 or 8 months ago, I think perhaps it would have been appropriate because Egypt indeed was engaging in what has been described as a cold peace; it seemed not to be adhering to the commitments it made in the Camp David agreements.

But over the course of the last few weeks, there has been the restoration, the renewal, fragile as it is, of the peace process; and it seems to me that now would be exactly the wrong time to adopt this kind of an amendment and send a message which would only chill those efforts.

So I would urge, along with my colleague, the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I would commend the gentleman for his concern over the Camp David accords, and I certainly commend him for his actions in drawing attention to the fact that Egypt has withdrawn its ambassador. But let me ask the gentleman: Does he share my concern about the trade and tourism agreements that were part of the Camp David accords that have not been lived up to?

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Well, of course, we all do. And I share those, as well as the concerns about the Ambassador, the concerns about the continuing anti-Semitism. And we have made our concerns known to Egypt. I think Mr. Mubarak has been fairly, not completely, but fairly forthcoming. But every country that we deal with has some significant failings that we are

constantly trying to remedy. But these people have put themselves on the line for peace.

It is significant that there is an existing peace treaty between an Arab country and Israel. We want more Arab countries to fall in line this way. We cannot get that to happen by cutting off what is necessary aid, even though we have concerns about their commitment to that written document. We keep fighting them on those issues, and slowly but surely we are beginning to see a little bit of progress. We are not giving them this money to commend them for their total day-to-day commitment to Camp David. This money is being extended in recognition of their major problems economically and the fact that they are an ally of the United States and will be of help in bringing peace to the region which will save this country, if it ever happened, untold billions of dollars and will save lives and do something this country desperately seeks to do, and that is to make a harmonious region out of the Middle East.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

(On request of Mr. KASICH and by unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of Florida was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that I think there are an awful lot of people in Israel who, over the last couple of years, have become increasingly disenchanted with the agreement that was made between Egypt and Israel and disenchanted for several basic reasons. No. 1, because of the situation regarding the withdrawal of the Ambassador.

□ 1440

Second, I think almost as strong a feeling in the minds of Israelis is the fact that the cultural exchanges have not taken place. They view cultural exchanges as critical to the way in which individuals can relate to one another and break down many of the barriers that have been created, particularly in the Egyptian press with many anti-Semitic comments, cartoons, articles, and a variety of other things.

I think that if today you were to talk to Israelis about where we stand, while they would tell you they are not satisfied with the progress that has been made in the area of cultural and ambassadorial exchange, I think they will tell you that this is a critical juncture. One only has to spend a short time in the Middle East to recognize the powderkeg that it is. Not only because of

the tremendous differences that separate these nations, but also because of the distance, the pure, physical distance. We have embarked now on very sensitive negotiations, and I think everyone in the Congress is watching very carefully what King Hussein has to say and what President Mubarak has to say, and more recently, what the Prime Minister of Israel, Mr. Peres, has to say. I think at this point in time, although it is still very early, there is cause for optimism.

In my judgment at this point it would be a mistake to try to alter the facts. It would be a mistake to try to change our policy because we seem to be going along the right path. To be honest, in this country, we have had great difficulty and great debate both within and without our State Department.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

(On request of Mr. KASICH and by unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of Florida was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I continue to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KASICH. As I said, there has been great debate about where we ought to head. And maybe for once we have hit upon the correct formula. To try to change that formula at this critical juncture by adding new equations to the formula in the Middle East, I think frankly, would be a major mistake. Let us give peace a chance. That is what we are talking about now.

Let us bring it along. Let us not throw any cold water in the face of any of the nations that are in the middle of this process right now. Let us not interject anything new into the formula because right now it seems to be working. I am going to tell my colleague from Florida, though, that if the Egyptians do not live up to their accord, if we do not see the kind of progress we want to see in the Middle East and this all turns out to be a charade, and I hope and pray it is not, I am going to support this kind of an amendment, because in my judgment the Egyptians have not stood by the accord and have had far too many excuses.

I hope this gives them the great opportunity to make up for their inaction and bring peace forward in that region.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of Florida was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Just let me say to my colleague from Ohio, I am not standing here supporting the Brown amendment. So if you tell me that you are going to be in favor of this amendment 1 year from now, I

will tell you that you are preaching to the choir. I just said the same thing.

If there is no compliance, if there is not commitment by Egypt, long term, and if we are going to help them with their problems including their economy like we are with the money that is in the supplemental, and we do not see any corresponding movement on their part to come closer to a day-to-day commitment to Camp David, I can assure you Mr. BROWN is going to have an awful lot of supporters for an amendment that might come up next time to cut aid.

I want to tell you that Israel, as an ally of the United States, has done a great deal to cooperate consistently with all of the kinds of things that the United States is trying to do for peace in this region. We have not had that kind of cooperation with every Arab State. We have gotten some with Egypt; we are trying to promote more. That is where we are.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RUDD. I think the gentleman was saying originally that the funding is not tied to the Camp David accords.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Well, I do not think that the Camp David accords provide for direct, significant funding.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUDD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, was there some discussion about limiting time? I notice it is about an hour on this, and I wonder if we would have some agreement as to the length of time on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time be limited to 3:15; 30 minutes. That is 30 minutes longer and it makes it more than an hour that you have had on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I just wonder whether we have some indication as to who is ready to speak. Other than Mr. BROWN, there has been nobody yet who has been able to speak in favor of this amendment. Most Members who have arisen are Members of the Appropriations Committee, which means that the rest of us are having trouble getting recognized.

I just want to be assured that some of us who want to speak in favor of the amendment may do so.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that those who might wish to speak on this stand at this time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. It would be about 7½ minutes for each.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto end at 3:15.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. Chairman, prior to that request, the Chair had granted this Member 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's 5 minutes is protected.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I thank the gentleman and I appreciate the time. This does not suggest in any way that you eliminate the funding for Egypt. The \$2.2 billion which is in the budget this year, stays in the budget. This amendment only deals with the supplemental; the bonus, if you will. So we are not talking about cutting off aid to Egypt; all we are talking about is not giving them a bonus.

A point has been raised with regard to the balance-of-payments situation with regard to Egypt. Their balance-of-payment situation is improving in contrast to ours.

They dropped their current accounts deficit from \$1.9 billion in 1982 to \$1 billion last year. That has been going down, not up. I would hope with regard to the kind of signal we send with this amendment that the Members would give that some reflection.

Here are the facts as I see them. First of all, Egypt has unilaterally withdrawn its Ambassador to Israel in direct violation of the Camp David accords. We are talking about giving them a bonus in light of them failing to comply with the accords.

Egypt has failed to live up to the trade and tourism agreements that came out of the Camp David accords. The problem with the signals discussion is that they have failed to comply with the Camp David accords. To give them more money in light of their failure to comply, I believe sends a clear signal that they do not have to comply.

Egypt has refused to let the U.S. Rapid Deployment Force use the Red Sea port on a regular basis. That surely cannot be a signal that we want to reward. In the United Nations, Egypt has voted against the United States' position 76.6 percent of the time. If you give a nation with this record a bonus over and above the \$2.2 billion, I submit you are sending a signal, but the signal is not one of urging them to comply with the Camp

David accords, it is one of rewarding them for failing to comply.

The CHAIRMAN. Members standing at the time the unanimous-consent request was agreed to will be recognized for 3½ minutes each.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

□ 1450

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Chairman, I do want to compliment our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for the manner in which he has, in the less than perfect of all worlds and with the very complex needs throughout the world, crafted a very remarkable piece of legislation.

I want to thank also the ranking minority Member, especially in regard to the part that deals with the problems in the Midwest, for the support that he has given this section of our supplemental legislation.

I believe that this is probably the best chance that we will have to deal with the problem in regard to Egypt's compliance with the Camp David accords. This piece of legislation, as far as I am concerned, will for the last time put the ball back in Egypt's court. We must now see that Egypt becomes part of the ball game again and moves closer to the spirit of Camp David accords, in regard to placing its Ambassador back in the State of Israel. The Israelis are now out of Lebanon, and the alleged reason for withdrawal of Egypt's Ambassador is no longer there.

I am especially concerned that we are now seeing additional anti-Israel statements in the Egyptian media in Egypt, and I think it is time that Egypt takes hold of this issue and does not permit this kind of inflammatory situation to continue.

The ball, as I say, is now in Egypt's court. It is up to them to play the game according to the rules of Camp David and to help bring peace to the Mideast in the real sense of the term.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROWN], which would strike \$500 million in supplemental economic assistance for Egypt from the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I might otherwise hesitate to rise on the floor in defense of unauthorized appropriations, but I feel that an exception should be made in the case of Egypt, the target of this amendment, and for Israel and certain other projects contained in this title of the bill.

To speak directly to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colora-

do, the funds appropriated for Egypt in this bill are for economic assistance. Any of my colleagues who have been to Egypt recently can attest not only to the depth of the poverty that exists in that country, but also to the great potential of that country and its people. The economic problems Egypt has been experiencing, and which the Egyptians have been overcoming through very rapid economic growth, result not only in human misery but also sow the seeds of political instability. A stable Egypt is crucial to the peace of the Middle East—not only because of Egypt's role in helping to end the Arab-Israeli conflict but also because of Egypt's importance in other arenas—its cultural leadership in the Arab world and its role in containing Libya. What would happen to American interests—to the interests of peace—if a Qadhafi- or Khomeini-like regime managed to install itself in Egypt? That is something we want to prevent.

This \$500 million supplemental appropriation is not a bonus—but a response to a serious economic crisis that Egypt faces.

Mr. Chairman, both the bill before us and the Foreign Affairs Committee's report provide for directions to the U.S. Government to assure that any ESF funds we provide be directed toward helping the Egyptians reach a goal of economic self-sufficiency. I am confident that with the continued support of my colleagues we can help them reach that goal.

Turning for a moment to the other provisions of the bill, note that it provides for \$1.5 billion in sorely needed economic assistance to Israel. This supplemental appropriation has been recommended by both the Foreign Affairs Committee and incorporated into the substitute to be offered by our ranking minority member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD]. The committee stated it has approved this amount because of an urgent need for expeditious assistance to Israel in its emergency efforts to address its economic crisis. The U.S. Government should continue to work with our allies in the Mideast, both Israel and Egypt, to find ways—other than the direct provision of funds—to help them out of their economic crisis.

I supported the \$1.5 billion supplemental in authorization form and I am pleased to support it here today. Israel has been plunged into a crisis of high inflation and resulting economic weakness because of a combination of factors, some of which are beyond the immediate control of the government, others of which the Israeli Government is attempting to get a handle on. These will be difficult steps, but I have confidence that they will be undertaken.

And let us bear in mind that these expenditures are an investment for

peace in the Middle East—far less costly than our financing any U.S. military initiative in the Middle East, in the event of the outbreak of any hostility.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the pending amendment and the passage of this needed supplemental appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, the committee report says, very interestingly, at one point:

The Committee recognizes the severity of Egypt's economic difficulties and believes that supplemental assistance can help Egypt overcome its pressing economic problems.

One has to wonder whether the committee recognizes the economic problems of this country. That is the real question in the Brown amendment.

We are talking \$500 million here. That is a big chunk of cash. It is being paid for with American taxpayers' money. What are the American taxpayers getting for their money? What is Egypt going to use the money for?

The committee says in the report that Egypt is going to use these funds to address its economic problems, and these economic problems include the rising international debt burden. Sound familiar? The need for significant structural reforms. Sound familiar? And pressing economic development requirements. Sound familiar?

It seems to me that the precise things that we say that we are sending \$500 million to Egypt for are things that American taxpayers would like to see some interest about in this particular body. We are talking about spending virtually all of the tax dollars contributed to this government by 143,000 American families. We are going to take all of the tax money contributed by 143,000 American families and send it to Egypt.

We are already sending to Egypt all of the money contributed by 572,000 American families. In other words, if you put those two together, all of the tax money being paid by several congressional districts in this country is already going to Egypt, and we are proposing to spend even more.

I think that is a clear question. It seems to me that in defending spending \$500 million additional for Egypt, we have heard some awfully backward foreign policy arguments. We have heard, for instance, discussed on the floor here today that words speak louder than deeds; that our foreign policy options are based upon that; that if we write a letter to Mubarak, that is enough; that he will pay more attention to the fact that a few of us write him a letter than he will to the fact that we are sending him more money.

My guess is, when he gets the \$500 million, he has to say, "All is forgiven," because that is the kind of action that people pay attention to. It is a little like the backwards foreign policy options that were the case with the SALT II yesterday by the administration: That somehow the Soviets are going to pay more attention to all of the tough language that was in the factsheet than they are to the fact that we are starting to dismantle our own defenses.

That kind of foreign policy just strikes me as being a little backwards. Here a week or so ago we got up all of our courage around here and literally cut off aid to the South Africans, or cut off all involvement with the South Africans, saying to the South Africans, "That is going to tell you that we are disgusted with you," and now we turn around and come back this week and suggest with that same kind of foreign policy option, that what we ought to say to Egypt is, "We are disgusted with you, too. We do not think you have been performing up to par, but we are going to give you 500 million bucks."

I just have to question whether or not that is what the American people think that this body should be doing. I question whether or not 143,000 American families want every dime that they will give to the American Government this year to go toward a bonus to Egypt. I question whether or not 572,000 American families want all of the money that they are now giving to Egypt to be paid out.

I think it is time to vote for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATKINS].

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I had planned to make a speech on this. I am afraid I stand here kind of heavy hearted, but probably what I would have to say would not make a contribution one way or the other, so in order to provide some time for our friend who serves on the Appropriations Committee, I would rather revise and extend my remarks and reluctantly just sit down heavy hearted and yield my time to the gentleman from New York, MATT McHUGH.

Mr. McHUGH. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding his time to me, and I will be very brief.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to stress the point that the money that is in the pipeline, approximately \$2 billion, is money which is not available to Egypt to deal with its current, immediate economic problem. There has been a legitimate question raised about the pipeline money and, indeed, if that money were available to Egypt to deal with the existing problem, then there would be no need to provide additional funding, and the ar-

gument for this amendment would certainly be sound.

But as has been stated previously by at least one or two speakers, the pipeline money is committed to long-term development projects which are very important to Egypt but which will take up that pipeline funding. The problem that is pending in Egypt arises from a number of unanticipated problems.

□ 1500

One of those problems relates to rising interest rates on indebtedness which has increased the debt burden on Egypt and can be said to be somewhat unanticipated.

Second, the oil revenue is down in Egypt, which, of course, has affected its current earnings.

Third, the use of the Suez Canal is less than anticipated because of the mining of the Suez Canal and the Red Sea, and it seems to me that is somewhat unanticipated as well.

There is no reason to provide any money to Egypt, however, unless we conclude that it is in the interest of the United States to do so, and I think other speakers have demonstrated very clearly that it is in the foreign policy, security, political interest of the United States in the Middle East to maintain a commitment to stability which inevitably involves a commitment to both Israel and Egypt, the two countries that have demonstrated very clearly and at some risk that they are committed to the peace process and they are committed to values and interests which are congruent to our own.

Mr. Chairman, it is for that reason that I suggest that we reject this amendment, and again I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATKINS] for yielding.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Chair for this opportunity to go through the amendment once more.

I will not belabor my colleagues with arguments that have already been made, but let me suggest that one of the deep concerns I think we all have is about bringing our budget back into line. This is a concern about American farmers who need to be put back in the market, a concern about American auto workers who need to have their jobs back, and a concern about Americans in all walks of life who are seeking a better way of life. Each and every one of us knows that getting a handle on our budget is critical to their economic future.

This Congress has acted. Almost every Member of this House has voted to freeze the NASA authorization for

next year. Almost every Member of this House, in a tough vote, voted to freeze the National Science Foundation for next year. Almost every Member of this House has voted to freeze the Bureau of Standards. Almost every Member of this House voted to at least freeze the maritime program or eventually to reduce it. This House is mindful, I am sure, of the concern we all have to get this budget in line.

Let me suggest a couple of things. First of all, this supplemental is \$2.7 billion over budget. This offers us an opportunity to reduce that by \$500 million. What we are asked is whether or not those who are willing to put a freeze on Federal employees' salaries and those who are willing to freeze important domestic programs are then going to turn around and throw money to Egypt in a \$500 million budget-busting amendment.

Mr. Chairman, all we are asking for is symmetry. We have done a good job. Let us not let the American people down now. Let us vote for this amendment. All it does is say that we are going to freeze the aid to Egypt at the \$2.2 billion level we had already planned on in the budget document itself.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but ask this question. I know it was indicated that the money that was being appropriated would help Egypt pay its debt or the interest on its debt. I am wondering, who is going to pay the \$150 billion interest on our debt for this year only?

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his important point.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has been very gracious with his time, and I compliment him on his sincerity and his concern about the national debt and the economy. As he knows, I have a great regard for him.

But how are we going to build friends in this world if the United States won't act in partnership with nations who are willing to risk something to join in an alliance, de facto though it may be, toward that peace process that is so important to all of us? How are we going to have access in the Middle East, the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, and other places if we do not have the cooperation of countries like Egypt?

This is one of the choke points, one of the strategic waterways of the whole world. I am not suggesting that Egypt has been perfect in its interna-

tional behavior or domestic policies, but I think it is ill-advised to oppose needed assistance when the Egyptians have taken great risks to join the United States in working out some peace process, far from perfect though it may be. Anwar Sadat lost his life gambling on peace. President Mubarak is taking a great risk in being a friend of the United States and of peace.

We are trying to bring King Hussein as well as the leaders of other moderate nations into the peace process to the advantage of Israel, its neighbors, and the United States. I think it is unhelpful intemperately to criticize Egypt when Egypt's support is so important to achieving our objective in the Middle East.

So I would ask my colleagues to please keep their rhetoric as responsible as possible because it is in this Nation's interest to have Egypt with us and not against us and not allied with the Soviet Union. Egypt kicked all of the Soviet Union's KGB agents and troops out a few years ago. They have taken some big risks in the interests of peace.

I believe that President Mubarak is pro-West and pro-Camp David, despite the statements to the contrary. I do not agree with Egypt's U.N. voting record, but nonetheless they are a moderating influence in an area of the world where extremism daily threatens the lives of our citizens and friends.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we would roundly, soundly defeat this amendment, even though it may have been offered in good spirit.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, the administration did not ask for this money gratuitously. They asked for it for one simple reason. We are a world leader. Thank God, we, not the Soviet Union, are the great power which is trusted on both sides in the Middle East today, and we would kind of like to keep it that way.

I had an interesting conversation with the editor of Izvestia 2 years ago in Moscow. He was giving me a great lecture about U.S. foreign policy failings in the Middle East, and when he got finished, I said, "Well, sir, you are pretty good at analyzing our potential weaknesses. Tell me, why do you think the Egyptians kicked you out of their country?"

And he said, "Well, of course, you understand Mr. Sadat was an alcoholic and he was a drug addict." He went into this wild personal attack on President Sadat. To me it was just another illustration of Soviet frustration because we have been able to serve as the principal mediator in the area over the last 15 years and they have not.

I submit there is nothing that you can do that would change that more

quickly than to pass this amendment today. The key question is not whether we are unhappy with Egypt's removal of its Ambassador on a temporary basis, the key question is not whether we like the Egyptian votes at the United Nations. The key question is whether the United States is going to be able to play the role of a major power in mediating between both sides in the Middle East, and this effort crafted by the administration is meant to assure that we do continue in that role.

As I said before, I have a lot of disagreements with this administration in a lot of areas, but the one place where they have done an excellent job is in the Middle East, and we ought not to muck it up by changing this request today. As the gentleman from New York said, this effort for peace cost Mr. Sadat his life.

□ 1510

Is not that enough? Is not that enough of an investment in the future to be made by that country? Do not we all have to remain partners in that tripartite process? How do we persuade Hussein? How do we persuade any Palestinian elements who might be interested to enter into a process that will lead to an expansion of Camp David?

You do not do it by adding \$1.5 billion to Israel's aid this afternoon and eliminating the request the administration made for Egypt's aid. You do it by recognizing that the United States needs a relationship not only with Israel, but with other Arab partners as well. A great power cannot just play one card. We have to stick with our friend, Israel, but we also have to cultivate other relationships and encourage other sensible conduct which is what the administration is trying to do.

I would urge you in the interest of furthering an administration policy which I believe to be right on target to oppose this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROWN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 110, noes 314, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 148]

AYES—110

Anderson	Boulter	Cheney
Applegate	Breaux	Coats
Archer	Brown (CO)	Cobey
Bates	Broyhill	Coble
Bereuter	Burton (IN)	Combest
Bilirakis	Chapple	Craig

Crane	Hubbard	Rudd
Dannemeyer	Hunter	Schaefer
Darden	Jacobs	Schroeder
Daub	Jenkins	Schuetter
Davis	Kastenmeier	Sensenbrenner
DeLay	Kindness	Shumway
Dickinson	Kleczka	Shuster
Donnelly	Kolter	Smith (NE)
Dreier	Kramer	Smith (NH)
Dyson	Lightfoot	Smith, Denny
Early	Lloyd	Smith, Robert
Emerson	Lott	Snyder
English	Lujan	Solomon
Evans (IA)	Marlenee	Stenholm
Fiedler	Martin (IL)	Strang
Fields	McCandless	Stump
Franklin	McCollum	Sundquist
Gaydos	Miller (OH)	Swindall
Goodling	Monson	Tallon
Gordon	Montgomery	Tauke
Gradison	Murphy	Tauzin
Gray (IL)	Nielsen	Taylor
Gregg	Pashayan	Thomas (CA)
Hall, Ralph	Petri	Valentine
Hansen	Ray	Vucanovich
Hartnett	Ritter	Walker
Hefner	Roberts	Watkins
Henry	Robinson	Whittaker
Hiler	Roemer	Whitten
Hillis	Rogers	Wyden
Hopkins	Roth	

NOES—314

Ackerman	de la Garza	Holt
Addabbo	Dellums	Horton
Alexander	Derrick	Howard
Andrews	DeWine	Hoyer
Annuizio	Dicks	Huckaby
Anthony	Dingell	Hughes
Armey	DioGuardi	Hutto
Aspin	Dixon	Hyde
Atkins	Dorgan (ND)	Ireland
AuCoin	Dornan (CA)	Jeffords
Badham	Dowdy	Johnson
Barnard	Downey	Jones (NC)
Barnes	Duncan	Jones (OK)
Bartlett	Durbin	Jones (TN)
Barton	Dwyer	Kanjorski
Bateman	Dymally	Kaptur
Bedell	Eckart (OH)	Kasich
Beilenson	Eckert (NY)	Kemp
Bennett	Edgar	Kennelly
Bentley	Edwards (CA)	Kildee
Berman	Edwards (OK)	Kolbe
Bevill	Erdreich	Kostmayer
Biaggi	Evans (IL)	LaFalce
Bliley	Fascell	Lagomarsino
Boehert	Fawell	Lantos
Boggs	Fazio	Latta
Boland	Feighan	Leach (IA)
Boner (TN)	Fish	Leath (TX)
Bonior (MI)	Flippo	Lehman (CA)
Bonker	Florio	Lehman (FL)
Borski	Foglietta	Leland
Bosco	Foley	Lent
Boucher	Ford (MI)	Levin (MI)
Boxer	Ford (TN)	Levine (CA)
Brooks	Fowler	Lewis (CA)
Broomfield	Frank	Lewis (FL)
Brown (CA)	Frenzel	Lipinski
Bruce	Frost	Livingston
Bryant	Fuqua	Loeffler
Burton (CA)	Gallo	Long
Bustamante	Garcia	Lowery (CA)
Byron	Gejdenson	Lowry (WA)
Callahan	Gekas	Luken
Campbell	Gephardt	Lundine
Carney	Gibbons	Lungren
Carper	Gilman	Mack
Carr	Gingrich	MacKay
Chandler	Glickman	Madigan
Chappell	Gonzalez	Manton
Clay	Gray (PA)	Markey
Coelho	Green	Martin (NY)
Coleman (TX)	Groberg	Martinez
Collins	Guarini	Matsui
Conte	Gunderson	Mavroules
Conyers	Hall (OH)	Mazzoli
Cooper	Hamilton	McCain
Coughlin	Hammerschmidt	McCloskey
Courter	Hatcher	McCurdy
Coyne	Hayes	McDade
Crockett	Hefel	McGrath
Daniel	Hendon	McHugh
Daschle	Hertel	McKernan

McKinney	Pursell	St Germain
McMillan	Quillen	Stallings
Meyers	Rahall	Stangeland
Mica	Rangel	Stark
Michel	Regula	Stokes
Mikulski	Reid	Stratton
Miller (CA)	Richardson	Studds
Miller (WA)	Ridge	Sweeney
Mineta	Rinaldo	Swift
Mitchell	Rodino	Synar
Moakley	Roe	Thomas (GA)
Molinari	Rose	Torres
Mollohan	Rostenkowski	Torricelli
Moody	Roukema	Towns
Moore	Rowland (CT)	Traficant
Moorhead	Rowland (GA)	Traxler
Morrison (CT)	Roybal	Udall
Morrison (WA)	Russo	Vander Jagt
Mrazek	Sabo	Vento
Murtha	Savage	Visclosky
Myers	Saxton	Volkmer
Natcher	Scheuer	Walgren
Neal	Schneider	Waxman
Nelson	Schulze	Weber
Nowak	Schumer	Weiss
O'Brien	Seiberling	Wheat
Oakar	Sharp	Whitehurst
Oberstar	Shaw	Whitley
Obey	Shelby	Williams
Olin	Sikorski	Wirth
Ortiz	Siljander	Wise
Owens	Sisisky	Wolf
Oxley	Skeen	Wolpe
Packard	Skelton	Wortley
Panetta	Slattery	Wright
Parris	Slaughter	Wyllie
Pease	Smith (FL)	Yates
Penny	Smith (IA)	Yatron
Pepper	Smith (NJ)	Young (AK)
Perkins	Snowe	Young (FL)
Pickle	Solarz	Young (MO)
Porter	Spence	Zschau
Price	Spratt	

NOT VOTING—9

Akaka	Hawkins	Staggers
Clinger	McEwen	Weaver
Coleman (MO)	Nichols	Wilson

□ 1520

Messrs. DONNELLY, HILER, KRAMER, and COATS changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1530

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words in order to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Wisconsin Mr. [OBEY], the Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Assistance.

Mr. Chairman, there has been concern expressed to me by individuals who have worked with the Egyptian Aid Program over several years with the provision of a large cash transfer totaling some \$500 million included in this bill. They argue and I am inclined to agree that we should set aside at least some of these funds for Project AID.

I wonder if the chairman could address this question.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me simply point out that this is an emergency assistance program to meet unique requirements which are

brought about by major foreign debt problem. That is why in this case we proceeded on a cash transfer basis, because it was the judgment of the administration that it was essential in this instance, given the special nature of the circumstances.

Mr. DICKS. It is the intention of the committee that by proceeding in this manner we are indicating that this is the way we should normally provide such economic assistance?

Mr. OBEY. No. This action does not provide in any way prejudice future conduct by the committee or future provision of funds. It is simply meant to deal with the specific problem at hand at this time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that efforts will be made to ensure that at least a portion of the regular currencies generated by this assistance will be used to undertake reforms or development activities by the Egyptians that would not otherwise be undertaken. Does the chairman support such an effort in general terms?

Mr. OBEY. I certainly would.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION
(DISAPPROVAL OF DEFERRAL)

The Congress disapproves the proposed deferral D85-40 relating to the African Development Foundation, as set forth in the message of February 6, 1985, which was transmitted to the Congress by the President. The disapproval shall be effective upon enactment into law of this bill and the amount of the proposed deferral disapproved herein shall be made available for obligation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read beginning with chapter VI.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER VI
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT

HOUSING PROGRAMS
RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE
(RESCISSION)

The limitation otherwise applicable to the maximum payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under section 236 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1), is further reduced in fiscal year 1985 by not more than \$23,367,000 in uncommitted balances of authorizations provided for this purpose in appropriation Acts.

PAYMENTS FOR OPERATION OF LOW-INCOME
HOUSING PROJECTS
(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

Of the funds appropriated under this heading in the Department of Housing and Urban Development-Independent Agencies Appropriation Act, 1985 (Public Law 98-371, 98 Stat. 1213, 1216), \$75,000,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That any balances of appropriations made available under such heading in such Act shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 9(d) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g), remain available for obligation for

the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and shall be used by the Secretary for fiscal year 1986 requirements in accordance with section 9(a) of such Act, as amended.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACTION GRANTS

Language under this heading in the Department of Housing and Urban Development-Independent Agencies Appropriation Act, 1985 (Public Law 98-371), is amended by striking out the first colon and all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$6,919,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$5,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1986: *Provided*, That these funds shall be available only for activities authorized by the Cigarette Safety Act of 1984 (Public Law 98-567).

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$5,000,000.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$4,125,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

ABATEMENT, CONTROL, AND COMPLIANCE

For an additional amount for "Abatement, control, and compliance", \$15,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1986.

CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

Language under this heading in Public Law 98-396 is amended by deleting "an operable sewage treatment facility at or adjacent to San Diego, California for the purpose only of intercepting and treating" and inserting in lieu thereof "a treatment works to address".

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$786,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLANNING AND
ASSISTANCE

(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$1,287,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

CONSUMER INFORMATION CENTER

(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$63,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE
ADMINISTRATION

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Language under this heading in the Department of Housing and Urban Development-Independent Agencies Appropriation Act, 1985 (Public Law 98-371), is amended by deleting "including \$155,500,000 for a space station, of which \$5,500,000 shall be

made available from prior year appropriations: *Provided*, "and inserting in lieu thereof "including \$150,000,000 for space station, to be combined with \$5,500,000 to be made available from prior year appropriations for a total of \$155,500,000; *Provided*, That the \$5,500,000 so identified shall be in addition to \$2,422,600,000 appropriated for Research and Development for fiscal year 1985: *Provided further*, ".

RESEARCH AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT
(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$6,000,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES
(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$1,000,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
OFFICE OF REVENUE SHARING, SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$90,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION
COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

For an additional amount for "Compensation and pensions", \$175,000,000, to remain available until expended.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For an additional amount for "Readjustment benefits", \$44,200,000, to remain available until expended.

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH
(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$150,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS
OPERATING EXPENSES
(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$2,109,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES
(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$2,000,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

CONSTRUCTION, MINOR PROJECTS
(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$377,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

Mr. WHITTEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that chapter 6 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against chapter VI?

Are there any amendments to chapter VI?

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER VII

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES
(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for "Management of lands and resources", \$45,000,000.

Of available funds under this head, \$2,900,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS
(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$350,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND
(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$2,951,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for "Resource management", \$1,200,000.

Of available funds under this head, \$1,900,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

CONSTRUCTION AND ANADROMOUS FISH
(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$40,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM
(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for "Operation of the national park system", \$9,560,000.

Of available funds under this head, \$4,300,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

CONSTRUCTION
(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$397,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND
(RESCISSION)

The contract authority provided for fiscal year 1985 by 16 U.S.C. 4601-10a is rescinded.

CONSTRUCTION (TRUST FUND)
(DISAPPROVAL OF DEFERRAL)

The Congress disapproves the proposed deferral D85-45 relating to the Department of the Interior, National Park Service, "Construction (Trust fund)", as set forth in the message of February 6, 1985, as amended, which was transmitted to the Congress by the President. The disapproval shall be effective upon enactment into law of this bill and the amount of the proposed deferral disapproved herein shall be made available for obligation.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY
SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH
(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$1,269,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE
LEASING AND ROYALTY MANAGEMENT
(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$1,764,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

PAYMENTS TO STATES FROM RECEIPTS UNDER
MINERAL LEASING ACT

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in fiscal year 1985 moneys received from sales, bonuses, royalties (including interest charges collected under the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982), and rentals of the public lands under the provisions of the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of 1920, as amended, and the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970, which are not payable to a State or to the Reclamation Fund, shall be available for the payment of interest in accordance with 30 U.S.C. 1721 (b) and (d), prior to the crediting of such funds to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

BUREAU OF MINES
MINES AND MINERALS
(DEFERRAL)

Of the funds appropriated and remaining available until expended under this head in the Act making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1985, and for other purposes (Public Law 98-473), \$1,355,000 shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 1985.

OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT
REGULATION AND TECHNOLOGY

For an additional amount for "Regulation and technology," \$4,800,000.

ABANDONED MINE RECLAMATION FUND
(DEFERRAL)

Of the funds appropriated under this head in the Act making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1985, and for other purposes (Public Law 98-473), \$3,233,000 shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 1985.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS
OPERATION OF INDIAN PROGRAMS
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS AND RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for "Operation of Indian programs", \$19,818,000, and \$4,900,000 which shall be derived by transfer from National Park Service, "National capital region arts and cultural affairs", such transferred funds to remain available for expenditure until September 30, 1986.

Of available funds under this head, \$2,800,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

CONSTRUCTION
(DISAPPROVAL OF DEFERRAL)

The Congress disapproves the proposed deferral D85-33 relating to the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, "Construction", as set forth in the message of November 29, 1984, as amended, which was transmitted to the Congress by the President. The disapproval shall be effective upon enactment into law of this bill and the amount of the proposed deferral disapproved herein shall be made available for obligation.

(DEFERRAL)

Of the funds appropriated under this head in Public Law 98-8, \$3,000,000 shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 1985.

UTAH PAIUTE TRUST FUND

For an additional amount for "Utah Paiute trust fund", \$50,000.

TERRITORIAL AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES
(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for "Administration of territories", \$1,994,000, to remain available until expended.

Of available funds under this head, \$107,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

RELATED AGENCIES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE
FOREST RESEARCH
(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$462,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY
(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$232,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM
(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for "National forest system", \$61,247,000.

Of available funds under this head, \$6,067,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

CONSTRUCTION
(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for "Construction", \$1,568,000, to remain available until expended.

Of available funds under this head, \$961,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

LAND ACQUISITION
(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$68,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
(DISAPPROVAL OF DEFERRAL)

The Congress disapproves \$38,925,000 of the proposed deferral D85-27A relating to the Department of Energy, "Fossil energy research and development", as set forth in the message of February 6, 1985, as amended, which was transmitted to the Congress by the President. The disapproval shall be effective upon enactment into law of this bill and the amount of the proposed deferral disapproved herein shall be made available for obligation.

FOSSIL ENERGY CONSTRUCTION
(DEFERRAL)

Of the funds available for obligation under this head, \$860,000 shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 1985.

NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES
(DEFERRAL)

Of the funds appropriated under this head in the Act making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1985, and for other purposes (Public Law 98-473), \$181,000 shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 1985.

ECONOMIC REGULATION
(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$102,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS
(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$51,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE
(DISAPPROVAL OF DEFERRAL)

The Congress disapproves the proposed deferral D85-31A relating to the Department of Energy, "Strategic petroleum reserve", as set forth in the message of February 6, 1985, as amended, which was transmitted to the Congress by the President. The disapproval shall be effective upon enactment into law of this bill and the amount of the proposed deferral disapproved herein shall be made available for obligation.

(DEFERRAL)

Of the funds appropriated under this head in the Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1984, and for other purposes (Public Law 98-396), \$156,000 shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 1985.

SPR PETROLEUM ACCOUNT
(DISAPPROVAL OF DEFERRAL)

The Congress disapproves the proposed deferral D85-42 relating to the Department of Energy, "SPR petroleum account", as set forth in the message of February 6, 1985, which was transmitted to the Congress by the President. The disapproval shall be effective upon enactment into law of this bill and the amount of the proposed deferral disapproved herein shall be made available for obligation.

ALTERNATIVE FUELS PRODUCTION
(DEFERRAL)

Of the funds available for obligation under this head, \$23,000 shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 1985.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES
(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$161,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

GENERAL PROVISION

Notwithstanding any other act, none of the funds made available to the Department of the Interior or the United States Forest Service during fiscal year 1985 by this or any other act may be used to implement the proposed jurisdictional interchange program.

Mr. WHITTEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that chapter VII be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against chapter VII? Are there any amendments to chapter VII?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, and particularly the distinguished chairman, Mr. YATES, and my good friend the ranking member, Mr. REGULA, for the efforts

and foresight to ensure the integrity of the strategic petroleum reserve.

By maintaining fiscal year 1985 funding for continued construction and maintenance of strategic petroleum reserve facilities, the subcommittee has preserved hundreds of jobs in south Louisiana and Texas.

Equally, and perhaps more important, I believe the subcommittee has significantly enhanced the energy independence and national security of our country.

Again, I thank Chairman YATES, Mr. REGULA, and the best of the Interior Subcommittee for disapproving the deferral of funding for construction and maintenance at all strategic petroleum reserve sites.

While I have concerns about indefinitely halting or even reducing the fill rate for the SPR, especially during a time of cheap oil availability, we must at least complete the construction and improvements scheduled for various sites, including Big Hill.

This can be accomplished and we can still realize substantial budget savings by reducing the fill rate, a recommendation this committee has already made. The General Accounting Office recently reported to Congress that the costs of developing SPR storage capacity—which are only 6 percent of total SPR costs—roughly \$500 million over 5 years—are minuscule compared to the cost of buying SPR oil—over \$8 billion.

I firmly believe that to withhold funding for facilities construction and improvements would be more costly in the long run, it would inflict another severe blow to the economy of south Louisiana and Texas, and it would severely impact the energy and security needs of our Nation.

The lead time in reopening and re-preparing sites for oil storage is too long to leave until a national emergency is upon us. The loss of trained personnel will be very costly to replace and over 100 jobs have already been lost as a result of the fiscal year 1985 deferral proposals. In addition, the cost of placing the partially completed facilities on standby and then renovating them when they are subsequently needed must also be considered. Higher subsequent costs for construction, labor, and materials will certainly have to be paid by the Government and taxpayers. But more importantly, the time and expense of readvertising, rebidding, conducting contract negotiations, and for remobilizing the construction process will result in, at the very least, a delay of 1 whole year before facilities construction or improvements can begin again, let alone enabling us to start filling the reserves with oil again.

The General Accounting Office, in its recent comprehensive cost/benefit analysis of a range of SPR size scenar-

ios done for various House and Senate committees, made some important conclusions.

First, the moratorium on construction will cost millions of dollars that would not otherwise have been spent. It is estimated that up to \$15 million would have to be spent to mothball and pay for electric power contracted for and not taken at the Big Hill site alone.

Second, the moratorium would mean that permits and warranties would expire and equipment would go untested at the Big Hill site.

Third, a moratorium is being proposed without study and analysis by the Department of Energy to support it. In fact, all DOE studies still support the 750 million barrel goal for SPR.

Finally, GAO has concluded that Big Hill would be the most reliable and cost effective site in the SPR system. Big Hill is the only site built by DOE specifically for SPR. Also, Big Hill currently is \$150 million to \$200 million under DOE's original cost estimates made 4 to 5 years ago. This is due in large part to the fact that oil and gas related construction costs in the region of Texas and Louisiana are running 20 percent to 30 percent below normal.

Without doubt, this is the time to proceed with construction of these reserve sites.

Mr. Chairman, most disturbing to me is the economic blow dealt to Louisiana and south Texas if facilities construction and improvement funding is eliminated. The six sites necessary for the eventual 750 million barrel reserve are all operating or under improvement and construction. Already \$150 million—or 25 percent of the estimated cost of Big Hill—has been expended. As I mentioned earlier the deferral of fiscal year 1985 funds has already cost the south Louisiana and Texas region from 100 to 200 jobs. Conservative estimates by contractors now working on the various reserve sites estimate that the entire region will lose approximately 900 jobs as well as payrolls and purchases totaling over \$100 million per year if facilities construction and improvements are not funded. Using the customary ratio of 6 to 1 to estimate the indirect economic impact of these losses, the real economic loss to our region could reach \$600 million per year.

The loss of these jobs and income would be devastating to Louisiana, a State where unemployment remains above the national average and nearly every major industry in the State has yet to recover from the 1981-82 recession.

Mr. Chairman, the latest Energy Information Administration estimates reveal that the United States imported 34 percent of its total consumption in 1984. This compares to 37 percent at

the height of the OPEC embargo in 1975, and 45 percent in 1978, the highest import year in recent history.

The Energy Information Administration forecasts that import consumption volumes will exceed the 1975 rate of 37 percent by next year, and the 1978 rate of 45 percent by 1990. Regardless of the source of these imports, these figures are very disturbing to anyone who believes that we should not be so dependent on unstable foreign oil supplies.

I urge the House to support the recommendations of this committee to disapprove the deferral of funds for the strategic petroleum reserve.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER VIII

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION

STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for "State unemployment insurance and employment service operations", from the Employment Security Administration Account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, \$30,000,000.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

PAYMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS

For an additional amount for "Payments to Social Security Trust Funds", not to exceed \$3,500,000,000 to carry out activities authorized by section 217(g), to remain available until December 31, 1985.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For the "Limitation on administrative expenses", \$10,000,000 for automatic data processing and telecommunications activities shall be derived from unobligated balances in the construction activity, to remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

HUMAN DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Human development services", \$6,000,000, for the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (Title III of Public Law 98-457.)

FAMILY SOCIAL SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Family social services", \$79,495,000, for parts A and E of title IV of the Social Security Act.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED

The \$61,000,000 appropriated in the Department of Education Appropriation Act, 1985, Public Law 98-619, for part D of the Education of the Handicapped Act shall be available for obligation on October 1, 1984, and shall remain available until September 30, 1985: *Provided*, That \$500,000 to support the 1985 International Winter Special Olympic Games shall be derived from the \$14,635,000 provided for special demonstration programs for the severely disabled, section 311 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, in the Department of Education Appropriation Act, 1985, Public Law 98-619, for the Rehabilitation Services and Handicapped Research appropriation account.

EMERGENCY IMMIGRANT EDUCATION

Funds appropriated in Public Law 98-151 for carrying out Emergency Immigrant Education Assistance under title V of H.R. 3520

as passed the House of Representatives on September 13, 1983 (subsequently enacted under Public Law 98-511), shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 1986.

STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Student financial assistance", \$287,000,000, which shall remain available until September 30, 1986, for carrying out subpart 1 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act.

GUARANTEED STUDENT LOANS

For an additional amount for "Guaranteed student loans", \$720,346,000, to remain available until expended.

HIGHER EDUCATION

Of the funds appropriated in 1985 for title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, \$15,200,000 for the endowment grant program under section 333 shall remain available until September 30, 1986.

Mr. WHITTEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that chapter VIII be considered as read, printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Are there any points of order against chapter VIII?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order that occurs on page 62 beginning at line 23, on the grounds that it violates rule XXI, clause 2, regarding legislating on an appropriations bill. That particular paragraph extends the availability of funds through September 30, 1986, which is not authorized under existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] desire to be heard?

Mr. NATCHER. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] will proceed.

Mr. NATCHER. As I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] he objects to that portion of the bill beginning on page 62 at line 22, under the heading "Student Financial Assistance" which relates to Pell grants. Is that correct?

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, this provision in the bill is very much in order and in full compliance with the Rules of the House of Representatives. It provides, as the chairman well knows, for an additional amount for student financial assistance, \$287 million, which shall remain available until September 30, 1986, for carrying out subpart 1 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act.

Now, Mr. Chairman, relates to Pell grant funding contained in the 1985 appropriation bill word for word. We, under this supplemental, increase it by

\$287 million. It is not in violation of any rule of the House and is very much in order.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, it is my belief that the availability until September 30, 1986 is not presently authorized and that that constitutes legislating in an appropriation bill and it is to that particular matter that my point of order goes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, with regard to Pell grants, sections 411(b)(4) (A) and (B) of title IV of the Higher Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1070(a)) provide that funds available for making payments under the Pell Grant Program shall remain available during the next succeeding fiscal year.

The annual appropriation for the Pell Grant Program is based on estimates of cost required to carry out the program established each year by authorizations and appropriations. Since the Pell Grant Program is forward funded, it is difficult to know in advance how much is required to meet the cost of the program for making payments for a particular academic year.

Since it is nearly impossible to know in advance the actual amount of the appropriation needed to allow the Secretary of Education to make Pell grant payments established by Congress, extended availability of funds is authorized by sections 411(b)(4) (A) and (B) to permit unobligated funds to carry forward to the next succeeding fiscal year.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, advance funding is authorized for all programs administered by the Secretary of Education by 20 U.S.C. 1223. Advance funding of education programs has been authorized since 1968. Most appropriations for education programs have been made on an advance funding basis since that time.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to certain programs administered by the Secretary of Education, 20 U.S.C. 3874 provides:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, unless expressly in limitation of this section, funds appropriated in any fiscal year to carry out activities under this chapter shall become available for obligation on July 1 of such fiscal year and shall remain available for obligation until the end of the succeeding fiscal year. (Public Law 97-35, title V, § 594, August 13, 1981, 95 Stat. 481.)

Mr. Chairman, for the foregoing reasons the point of order should be overruled.

□ 1540

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to respond further, or to withdraw his point of order.

Mr. WALKER. No, Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order, and let me make a couple of remarks with regard

to the contention of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. Chairman, the applicable authorization relating to this paragraph is section 411 of the Higher Education Act.

Subsections (b)(4) (A) and (B) of this section permit extended availability of funds only in limited circumstances, where there is an excess of funds over and above the amount needed to make payments in the current fiscal year.

The paragraph to which I raise an objection under rule XXI, clause 2, in no way limits the extended availability of the supplemental funds being provided to the circumstances required under section 411 of the Higher Education Act. The paragraph to which I object authorizes extended availability of funds regardless of whether the funds to remain available are in excess of the amount needed to make payments in the current fiscal year, and so exceeds the conditions under which extended availability is currently authorized, and so constitutes legislation on an authorization bill.

The law to which the gentleman from Kentucky refers does in fact do the things that the gentleman talks about; however, it is the question of extended availability of funds regardless of whether the funds to remain available are in excess of the amount needed to make payments.

In this case what we are doing is we are appropriating money up front, and then carrying that over, and that exceeds the authority of the law.

Let me also go to the question of the General Education Provisions Act.

Mr. Chairman, this section is not applicable to the situation at hand, section 412 of the General Education Provisions Act addresses itself to the situation where a school has received an allocation of funds from a Federal education program but has not spent all of those funds in the current fiscal year. Section 412 authorizes that school to retain the funds for another fiscal year.

The operative phrase in section 412 is "educational agencies or institutions." Extended availability is authorized only to educational agencies or institutions. Under Section 400A (a)(2)(C), "educational agency or institution" is defined as "any public or private agency or institution offering education programs." Obviously this does not include the U.S. Department of Education, since the Department does not offer education programs, but rather provides grants to institutions to offer education programs.

The paragraph to which I object under the rule does not limit itself to agencies or institutions offering education programs, but rather would authorize extended availability of funds to the U.S. Department of Education, and so exceeds the current authorization for extended availability on the

books, and constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BROWN of California). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair has listened to the arguments very persuasively put forward by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the statement of the gentleman from Kentucky, and the Chair is convinced that the provisions of title 20 United States Code section 3874 are broad enough in their application to support the extended availability of the funds in question, and accordingly the Chair overrules the point of order of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Are there points of order against this section?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, the very able chairman of the Appropriations Committee Mr. WHITTEN, and the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee Mr. CONTE, for getting this supplemental bill to the floor.

I would also like to express my appreciation, and that of the other members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for the work of the chairman of the Subcommittee on HUD-Independent Agencies, Mr. EDDIE BOLAND, and the able ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Mr. GREEN, who once again show their deep commitment to our Nation's veterans as reflected in this supplemental.

All veterans are grateful for the support they have received from the Appropriations Committee. The bill under consideration today, H.R. 2577, is a perfect example of congressional action to preserve and maintain an adequate level of veterans' benefits and health care services.

The bill provides funding for the cost of living allowance increases which the Congress passed last year.

I am especially pleased with that part of the supplemental that would restore funds to cover increased pay costs for employees who provide medical care to veterans. The administration proposed that the VA absorb over half of the costs associated with the pay raise given employees effective January 1. The effect of this proposal is to cut employment in VA hospitals and nursing homes by nearly 2,100 people. During the past several weeks I have included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD descriptions of serious staffing and equipment shortages that currently exist at many VA hospitals.

I expressed my concern earlier this year to Mr. BOLAND and Mr. GREEN and am pleased with the action the subcommittee and the full committee have taken to make sure that the staffing level is adequate for the current fiscal year. Every VA hospital di-

rector has been informed of the action of the Appropriations Committee and they are most grateful for the support shown by the House.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize that the administration should recognize that Members of the House are together when it comes to meeting the health care needs of veterans. The message we want to convey to the administration is this. When the Congress appropriates a level of FTEE and resources for staffing of VA medical centers, we expect the agency to maintain that level. We intend to accept nothing less and we will hold the VA accountable if these funds are not spent in accordance with the wishes of the Congress.

I thank the committee for its action and am certain our Nation's veterans are equally grateful.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to chapter VIII?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER IX

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

PAYMENTS TO WIDOWS AND HEIRS OF DECEASED MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

For payment to Catherine S. Long, widow of Gillis W. Long, late a Representative from the State of Louisiana, \$75,100.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

For an additional amount for "Salaries, officers and employees", \$130,000.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

For an additional amount for "Committee employees", \$2,799,000.

ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Allowances and expenses", \$5,603,000.

JOINT ITEMS

OFFICIAL MAIL COSTS

For an additional amount for "Official mail costs", \$11,853,000.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that chapter IX be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against chapter IX?

Are there any amendments to chapter IX?

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer three amendments, all of which go to the issue, and I ask unanimous consent that those three amendments be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. WALKER: "On page 63 strike everything between line 17 and line 25 and strike everything between line 1 and line 4 on page 64."

"On page 80, strike everything between line 22 and line 2 on page 82."

"On page 83, strike everything between line 1 and line 13."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendments.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, these amendments go to my feeling that we ought to be very careful with this whole business of supplemental appropriations. It seems to me that one way to make the case that we should be careful about the business of supplemental appropriations is to look at our own situation.

The amendments that I have offered here strike the money from the supplemental appropriations bill that will go toward additional moneys for the House of Representatives and also for the Executive Office of the President.

It will save in total a little bit more than \$30 million. Why am I doing it? I am doing it because I believe we have got a problem with this whole business of supplemental appropriations. I think supplemental appropriations are supposed to be to meet emergency needs of the Government.

The fact is that they have become a catchall for nearly everything imaginable, and the fact is that supplemental appropriations have been largely responsible for the fact that Congress, over the last 5 years, has exceeded its own budget by \$157 billion.

Now it is that kind of spending that has gotten this Government and this country in trouble, and I suggest that we ought to get serious about looking at that kind of problem, a problem of overspending, and that one of the places that we ought to begin to get serious is with our own legislative shop.

Here, in this body, we will spend in the course of this legislative year, as a total, as a congressional appropriation, \$1.5 billion. One and one-half billion dollars represents all of the tax money paid by 429,000 American families—429,000 American families are doing nothing but paying taxes to support the legislative branch.

It is my contention that out of that \$1.5 billion that we ought to be able to find—we ought to be able to find enough money to take care of our supplemental needs without asking the taxpayers to pay more. Without going to an additional 8,600 families and saying, "We've gone over what we originally appropriated; now we're going to ask you to pay some more."

Because that is what the particular measures in this bill would do; they would go to 8,600 more families across this country and say, "Ante up, folks; Congress overspent what we thought we were going to need."

Now there are things in here that I am sure we are going to be told are absolutely essential; that we have got to

take care of the pay raises, we have got to take care of the additional mailing costs, we have got to take care of all of these things which are heavily worthwhile items in order to keep this body running.

□ 1550

I think out of a \$1.5 billion budget we ought to be able to do those things. And if the fact is we are not budgeting wisely enough to understand that we are going to have additional costs, then it raises a question.

Local governments back home do not have the luxury of doing this. I defy you to find very many local governments across this country who, after they have budgeted in a particular year, and after they have appropriated money for a particular year, can come back midyear and say, "Oh, we have made a mistake, folks," and so on; "we are going to have to raise your tax, we are going to have to do something in order to get some additional money."

But that is exactly what we are doing with regard to ourselves. I think that here is a place where we can say, "Let's not spend the \$30 million, let's not spend a \$30 million additional bill, let's not have \$30 million of add-on spending here in the Congress; let's, at a time when we are facing a fiscal crisis in this country, find a way within our own budgets to meet this need."

And I would hope that we would be willing to do that. I would hope that we would be willing to find \$30 million so that 8,600 more American families do not have to spend all of their money just to fund our add-on expenses. That is the issue here. And I think that if we are going to be responsible and responsive to what I hear the American people saying, at the very least, what we could do is cut back on what we do.

I must say that I have included, also, here the Executive Office of the President as a part of this measure, because it is not just us. It seems to me that the President ought to be sensitive to some of these kinds of things to and ought not be sending us supplemental requests if he does see a particular need for them and an emergency need. That does not exist.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I do so because we are serious in the legislative branch of Government, and we do a very thorough job of budgeting. We are talking about less than a \$30 million supplemental to the regular fiscal 1985 bill of \$1.5 billion appropriation. That is a 2-percent adjustment, which is brought about only because of the requirements that are forced upon us

by events that are beyond the immediate control of our committee.

I would like to take a few minutes, and I do not expect anyone else on our side to explain these facts, so I will beg the indulgence of my colleagues. I would like the Members to know that they have no reason to vote for this amendment, they can rest assured that we are acting with prudence in the legislative subcommittee and that we do not bring to the floor anything that is frivolous or that unnecessarily burdens the American family or taxpayer.

Let me cite the items that would be eliminated by this amendment. The \$130,000 for the services of mail delivery personnel hired by the Postmaster; \$2,799,000 for committee employees; \$5,603,000 for official expenses of the Members; \$11,853,000 for official mail costs of the House and the Senate.

I might add that, despite the gentleman's statement, several items are an emergency or unexpected. We did not appropriate funds for the postal rate increase of last February that were made by an independent entity, the Postal Rate Commission; we did not and cannot always predict the flow of mail into this institution that required the services of temporary postal employees. We must stay in communication with our constituents, and when the mail comes in, it must be answered.

We looked at these very carefully, all of these items proposed for deletion. We denied a number of items that were possible to defer to the next fiscal year or simply reject out of hand. The ones we allowed were placed in the bill because they are necessary and because they are needed to allow the House to operate efficiently.

Let me describe them: Salaries of officers and employees. We provide \$130,000 for 17 temporary and 3 permanent employees approved for the Postmaster last October. These positions were approved by the House Administration Committee under their authority in title 2 of the U.S. Code. The people are already on board, and they have been for some time, handling the millions of pieces of mail that are sent to the House Members. The action has already taken place. We now have the responsibility of approving the salary money to make sure that these people are compensated for the effort they are putting forth. The workload justifies these new employees. The Postmaster had a 30-percent increase in incoming mail last year, from 153 million pieces in 1983 to over 200 million in 1984. I think with the tax bill this year, with the problems with the budget, we are going to see even more mail flowing into and out of this institution.

I know the gentleman who offered the amendment surely remembers the delays we all experienced last year in

receiving mail from our constituents. The action in this bill was the solution to that problem.

Committee employees. We have in this bill \$2.8 million for the staffs of the standing committees. All of us know that they are essentially the backbone of this institution. This funding is simply essential. It is needed to pay the costs of the staffs that are allowed under rule XI of the House to each standing committee.

Why do we need a supplemental? Because we simply underestimated the need in the original 1985 appropriation. As matters now stand, the committee employee account is funded at a level which is \$30,000 below the actual expenditure in fiscal year 1984, the previous year. If we do not have the funds necessary to pay our committee employees we will have to lay off many of them. Some of them are our most experienced people. Or we will have to take other kinds of drastic and disruptive action. We would be cutting, as we all know, the muscle out of the legislative process.

Are we going to lay off the Ways and Means staff as they go through this comprehensive rewrite of our Tax Code? Are we going to avoid responsibility for passing a budget resolution with inadequate Budget staff? The Appropriations Committee has the responsibility of providing the funds to operate the entire Government. I do not think we are about to lay those people off.

We do not need to apologize to the American public for the relatively small amounts expended for our employees. Legislative branch salaries for our professional staff are far below those at OMB or in the Executive Office.

And I want to quote from the administration, because they have made this concession. The fact is on the record. OMB, in the submission of their budget to the Congress for 1986 said:

*** real budget authority per employee in House Clerk Hire accounts has fallen by 21 percent, as salary increases—and average starting salary levels—have fallen sharply behind overall inflationary trends since 1971.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FAZIO was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. FAZIO. They also said:

"Correspondingly, House committee staff salary budget authority has on average fallen 24 percent while Senate committee staff average salaries have dropped in real terms by 18 percent.

We budget these accounts very closely. I might tell my colleague from Pennsylvania. If each committee spent the maximum allowed under rule XI, we would be spending far more, some \$17 million more. As it stands, even

with this supplemental, we are still underfunded in this account from the authorization level by some 30 percent.

And an even more important point: Our committees actually employ now about the same number of employees as they did in 1977, about 2,150 people. That is, 8 or 9 years later. The committees of the House are showing admirable restraint. We are not growing by leaps and bounds as some would have you believe.

Then we have the allowances for the Members, the expenses of running our offices, the official expenditures that we must make. We all know how telephone costs have increased, we know that rent and travel costs are up. I do not think, again, that we have been out of line in the appropriation of funds in this area. They are 22 percent less than authorized by the Administration Committee. Members' official allowances are underfunded by \$21.1 million. In other words, the average Member only spends about 78 percent of their office allowance. I do not think we are overspending. I think we ought to be telling our constituents that we are saving dollars, not projecting an image that we are overspending for the benefit of some Members.

Official mail. We have the funding for franked mail at \$11.9 million. This funding is justifiable, as I indicated, based on the responsibilities that are performed by the Franking Commission and by other entities in the House. We are responding to the Postal Service. They have told us they underestimated the need last year and that this additional appropriation is necessary. I have no reason not to believe them.

It is important that we stay in touch with our constituents through the mails. Are we not going to respond to their requests on case work, on the important rewriting of the tax bill, on Social Security or veterans benefit issues? I think we have to and we have to pay the mail bill.

Pay costs are very important, as well. Pay costs are important because they keep faith with the staff and employees who have already been given the 3.5 percent cost-of-living adjustment authorized by the President this past January. The gentleman's amendment would eliminate the funds for that cost-of-living raise.

I think it is important to note that the legislative branch portion of the bill has absorbed 54 percent of the additional costs of that pay increase. And I think that is important to underscore because we do in that context far better than the executive branch does. We are forcing the agencies and other entities in the legislative branch, not just the congressional operations of the House and Senate, but those other entities that serve us like the GAO, the Congressional Budget

Office, and so forth, we are forcing them to absorb the cost of the pay adjustment that we have made available to their employees by forcing them to reduce other areas of their budget. I think it is important that we understand that the \$9.1 million that we are providing in the pay cost title is minuscule in light of the \$4 billion necessary for the entire executive branch. They have only absorbed 34 percent of the cost of the additional pay while the legislative branch absorbed 56 percent.

□ 1600

I think it would be fair to conclude that this package is responsible as it treats the legislative branch. I would say also with respect to the gentleman's amendment as it relates to the Executive Office of the President, that we are only providing what the President requests. In the spirit of comity, the committee bill did not cut the Executive Office that is so important to the functioning of the Presidency.

I know that every Member in this Chamber will agree with me that the responsibilities of that office are tremendous; any reduction in funds could result in cutbacks in personnel or elimination of functions previously provided for by the Congress, and would be extremely disruptive to the President.

I am not going to participate in any partisan gamesmanship here; I think it is important that we fund, in respect for the Presidency the Chief Executive of this Government, the amount of money that was requested of us.

So I would urge that funds for the Executive Office of the President and for the legislative branch be enacted. I do not ask that the legislative branch be enacted at the level that was requested. We have made a significant reduction in those proposals. I do ask it for the Executive Office of the President and I do ask that the Members defeat the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHARP). The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] has expired.

(On request of Mr. WALKER and by unanimous consent, Mr. FAZIO was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. FAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, let me first of all say that I do think that the gentleman from California and his ranking Member from California do an excellent job of keeping track of the appropriations.

I just have the feeling though that in the supplemental appropriation we do have some areas that we could think about that go beyond the statement that the gentleman made. In the

official mailing costs, for example, that item of \$11 million, it is my understanding that a significant portion of that if not all of that could be absorbed if every Member of Congress sent out one less newsletter this year.

In other words, the sacrifice to us in order to lower the amount of spending by that much would be for everyone to send out one less mass mailing to their district; one less newsletter. It is simply my suggestion that we are not faced with exactly a dire emergency when we could respond to the situation by all of us deciding that we could get along with one less newsletter.

The gentleman well knows that I believe in that kind of communication with constituents too, to which he referred. But the question becomes whether or not we could not get by with one less newsletter in order to save somewhere around \$11 or \$12 million.

Mr. FAZIO. I happen to agree that we need to make some savings in the postal area. I have made that view clear in committee and I have talked to a number of my colleagues, some of whom are on the Franking Commission.

This is one of those nonpartisan no-no's around here that people do not like to talk about, and I certainly do not want to become bold and definite in my comments until I understand and feel a consensus building about how we might reach some of these postal cost containment proposals.

I am not going to, at this point, necessarily agree with the gentleman's statement, but I do think we have to find some ways to reduce or contain costs. Perhaps the best way to begin is through voluntary requests from our leadership, to make some savings in the postal area.

I would remind the gentleman that it is difficult for each Member to be treated equally in this area. Some of us have districts and constituents that are more communicative than others.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FAZIO was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. FAZIO. We have committee memberships that will vary tremendously in the volume of mail with which we will be confronted. I can only cite again the Ways and Means Committee's burdens this year on the tax measure, as an example.

So it would be hard for me to generalize and agree with his amendment, but I think the gentleman makes a point that is worth considering in the future—not however in this meat-ax approach that places no limitation on any Member. It simply defers meeting our responsibilities.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, not because I do not agree with the concerns expressed by my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER]. He and I share very strongly that objective of many Members of the House to get a handle on the rising costs of Government. I must say that many of the questions that he was raising here that Bob would have apply across the board in terms of Government have been very carefully been addressed by the work of this subcommittee.

I want to extend both my appreciation and my support for the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. FAZIO, who makes it his business to see that section by section in this portion of the bill we purposely underfund to keep pressure on the process. We underfund many of these accounts as much as 30 percent.

As a matter of fact, if you will take just the mail area as an illustration, we get our estimates regarding how much mail we might be required to use and the number of dollars involved approximately 2 years before the actual expenditure takes place. Little items do develop around here that change our expectations. For example, just about a week ago, in response to the President's address, relative to the tax bill, our colleague, DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, made an excellent presentation before the American public regarding the tax measure. We will remember for a long, long time his smiling at the American public and saying, "If you agree with me or you are concerned about this bill, just write Rosty. Send it to the Capitol and write Rosty."

He followed that, even better yet, "Write your own Member of Congress." We anticipate in the short time just ahead of us that probably that each Member will receive thousands of letters from concerned constituents as a result of that activity alone. That will very likely end up being paid for in a supplemental appropriation in the 1986 bill. We cannot anticipate that kind of explosion of public interest and concern about what is going on within their Federal Government.

Clearly, if the people are going to participate, clearly we want our membership to respond and communicate with them so that they can effectively interact with our process.

I must say, Mr. Chairman, beyond that a good deal of the difficulty we have here comes because of the fact that we purposely underfund some of our staff positions in the House. We do not want every committee slot automatically filled. The bill is designed to keep the pressure on. Indeed, in this supplemental we have funded only approximately 56 percent of the requests for supplemental. The balance of 44 percent, the individual agencies and committees are being

asked to absorb the growth and expected growths in their costs.

It is very clear, Mr. Chairman, that as we go about attempting to control the growth of the Federal Government the first place we should be willing to look it to the legislature itself. We need to lead the way in terms of cut, squeeze, and trim in this process. That is the job of this subcommittee report. As a matter of fact, I must say that between our staff and the bipartisan effort that takes place within our committee, we do lead the way. As a practical fact of life, if we are not willing to say we are going to be tough on our budgets as well, then how can we expect the rest of Government to do the same.

The \$11.853 million which has been discussed relative to mail costs focuses upon our concern very well. Recently I have been given the questionable privilege of joining the Franking Commission to join people like my colleagues, BILL FRENZEL and Mr. UDALL of Arizona to see how we can best go about convincing both our leadership and our membership that maybe there are ways we can cut back the mail. Those cutbacks certainly should not be taking place in terms of our responsibility to respond to requests of our constituents.

On the other hand, it may be that the membership will decide in the future that this load is so great that perhaps we should trim in some of our own unsolicited mailing. That is a very controversial and difficult subject area, but we on the Franking Commission will be attempting to deal with it. The purpose of our trying to deal with it is to make certain that we continue in this subcommittee report to lead the way in terms of attempting to cut back the cost of our Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, while I am sure all of us will agree with the fundamental thrust of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in this case, the job has already been done, and I must say that from there I want to express my appreciation to Mr. WALKER for his very, very careful efforts in terms of holding down the cost of Government.

□ 1610

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments, and I would like to specifically address the reductions in the Executive Office of the President.

My good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is well intentioned with his amendment to control the growth in Federal personnel and spending. I agree that every agency of the Government should share equally in this effort to reduce the deficit, and the leaders of Government should set the example. However, the facts support-

ing the committee recommendation indicate that this amendment goes too far and may have unintended results.

The Executive Office of the President is unique in many ways among the agencies of the executive branch. Most importantly, in this case, the EOP is an extremely labor-intensive office. Most of the funds provided are used to pay either personnel costs or mandatory rent on office space. There is little, if any, discretionary spending. Therefore, major reductions in funding will surely affect the efficiency and effectiveness of this important function. And no one can dispute the fact that the duties and responsibilities of the President have increased over the years.

Yet, during the past few years under the Reagan administration, Executive Office funding for all categories has decreased by 13 percent in real terms since 1980. This reduction has occurred despite mandated GSA rent increases of 124 percent and personnel costs-of-living increases of 22 percent over the same period. This funding restraint is especially significant in view of the fact that these two items constitute over 73 percent of the EOP budget.

In terms of personnel, permanent positions within the Executive Office of the President have decreased by 261 or 16 percent since 1980.

Similarly, funding for discretionary items has decreased in real terms by \$3.5 million over the same period.

The fiscal restraint shown over the years in the budget for the Executive Office of the President is present in the supplemental request before the House today.

The six agencies of the Executive Office funded in this pay supplemental have been allocated only 50 percent of the amount required to fund the entire January pay raise. And what has not been mentioned is the fact that several agencies of the Executive Office were forced to absorb 100 percent of the pay increase.

The Council of Economic Advisers, the National Security Council and the Office of Policy Development were given no funds to make up the 3.5-percent pay increase. In fact, the total amount for the Executive Office pay supplemental is less than 1-percent increase in fiscal year 1985 funding for the EOP.

Let me just say in closing that it's not easy to vote increased funding for a Federal bureaucracy. But in this case, any further reduction in funding would result in personnel cutbacks and the curtailment of important functions mandated by law. The amendment will have a negative effect on the operations of the Executive Office of the President.

I urge the House to reject this amendment. Now that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has

learned all this for the first time, I am sure he is not going to press his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHARP). The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 149]

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—416

Ackerman	Chapple	Fascell
Addabbo	Cheney	Fawell
Alexander	Clay	Fazio
Anderson	Coats	Feighan
Andrews	Cobey	Fiedler
Annunzio	Coble	Fields
Anthony	Coelho	Fish
Applegate	Coleman (TX)	Flippo
Armedy	Collins	Florio
Aspin	Combest	Foglietta
Atkins	Conte	Ford (MI)
AuCoin	Conyers	Fowler
Badham	Cooper	Frank
Barnard	Coughlin	Franklin
Barnes	Courter	Frenzel
Bartlett	Coyne	Frost
Bateman	Craig	Fuqua
Bates	Crane	Gallo
Bedell	Crockett	Garcia
Bellenson	Daniel	Gaydos
Bennett	Dannemeyer	Gejdenson
Bentley	Darden	Gekas
Bereuter	Daschle	Gephardt
Berman	Daub	Gibbons
Bevill	Davis	Gillman
Biaggi	de la Garza	Gingrich
Billirakis	DeLay	Glickman
Billiey	Dellums	Gonzalez
Boehlert	Derrick	Goodling
Boggs	DeWine	Gordon
Boland	Dickinson	Gradison
Boner (TN)	Dicks	Gray (IL)
Bonior (MI)	Dingell	Gray (PA)
Bonker	DioGuardi	Green
Borski	Dixon	Gregg
Bosco	Donnelly	Grotberg
Boucher	Dorgan (ND)	Guarini
Boulter	Dowdy	Gunderson
Boxer	Downey	Hall (OH)
Breaux	Dreier	Hall, Ralph
Brooks	Duncan	Hamilton
Broomfield	Durbin	Hammerschmidt
Brown (CO)	Dwyer	Hansen
Broyhill	Dymally	Hartnett
Bruce	Dyson	Hatcher
Bryant	Early	Hayes
Burton (CA)	Eckart (OH)	Hefner
Burton (IN)	Eckert (NY)	Heftel
Byron	Edgar	Hendon
Callahan	Edwards (CA)	Henry
Campbell	Edwards (OK)	Hertel
Carney	Emerson	Hiller
Carper	English	Hillis
Carr	Erdreich	Holt
Chandler	Evans (IA)	Hopkins
Chappell	Evans (IL)	Horton

Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
Kiecicka
Kolbe
Kolter
Kostmayer
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Latta
Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Loeffler
Long
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
Lungren
Mack
MacKay
Madigan
Manton
Markay
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (CA)

Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mitchell
Moakley
Molinar
Mollohan
Monson
Montgomery
Moody
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pursell
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Rudd
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Saxton
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schuette
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Sensenbrenner
Sharp

Shaw
Shelby
Shumway
Shuster
Sikorski
Siljander
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NH)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny
Smith, Robert
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Stallings
Stangeland
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strang
Stratton
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swift
Swindall
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tausin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Watkins
Waxman
Weber
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wyllie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zschau

□ 1630

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Four hundred and sixteen Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand of the

gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair announces that 5 minutes will be allowed for this vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 202, noes 217, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 150]

AYES—202

Andrews
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Badham
Bartlett
Barton
Bedell
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Bevill
Billirakis
Billiey
Boehlert
Boner (TN)
Boulter
Breaux
Broomfield
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Burton (IN)
Byron
Callahan
Kaptur
Campbell
Carper
Chandler
Chapple
Cheney
Coats
Cobey
Coble
Combest
Courtner
Craig
Crane
Daniel
Dannemeyer
Daub
DeLay
DeWine
DioGuardi
Dorgan (ND)
Dreier
Duncan
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Eckert (NY)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Evans (IA)
Fawell
Fiedler
Fields
Flippo
Franklin
Frenzel
Gallo
Gekas
Gingrich
Gilckman
Goodling
Gordon
Gradison
Gregg

Grotberg
Gunderson
Hall, Ralph
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hartnett
Heftel
Hendon
Henry
Hiller
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Ireland
Jacobs
Johnson
Jones (OK)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kemp
Kindness
Kolbe
Kramer
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NH)
Smith, Denny
Smith, Robert
Snowe
Snyder
Solomon
Spence
Stangeland
Stenholm
Strang
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swindall
Tallon
Tauke
Tausin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Watkins
Weber
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wyllie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zschau

Penny
Petri
Porter
Pursell
Ray
Regula
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Roemer
Rogers
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rudd
Saxton
Schaefer
Schneider
Schuette
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Sikorski
Siljander
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NH)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny
Smith, Robert
Snowe
Snyder
Solomon
Spence
Stangeland
Stenholm
Strang
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swindall
Tallon
Tauke
Tausin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walgren
Walker
Watkins
Weber
Whittaker
Wise
Wortley
Wyllie
Yatron
Young (FL)
Zschau

NOES—217

Ackerman
Alexander
Anderson
Annunzio
Anthony
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Barnard
Barnes
Bateman
Bates
Bellenson
Berman
Blaggi
Boggs
Boland
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Brooks
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Carney
Carr
Chappell
Clay
Coelho
Coleman (TX)

Collins
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Coughlin
Coyne
Crockett
Darden
Daschle
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dowdy
Downey
Durbine
Dwyer
Dymally
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Fowler
Frank
Frost
Fuqua
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hatcher
Hayes
Hefner
Hertel
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hyde
Jeffords
Jenkins
Jones (NC)
Jones (TN)
Kastenmeier
Kennelly
Kildee
Kiecicka
Kolter
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lantos
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Long
Lowry (WA)
Luken
Lundine
MacKay
Manton
Markay
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McDade
McGrath
McHugh
McKinney
Mica
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mitchell
Moakley
Molinar
Mollohan
Moody
Morrison (CT)
Mrazek
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Owens
Panetta
Parris
Pease
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Price
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Reid
Richardson
Rodino
Roe
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Scheuer
Schroeder
Schumer
Seiberling
Sisisky
Skelton
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Solarz
Spratt
St Germain
Stallings
Stark
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Swift
Synar
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Vento
Visclosky
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whitten
Williams
Wirth
Wolf
Wolpe
Wright
Wyden
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (MO)

NOT VOTING—14

Addabbo
Akaka
Brown (CA)
Bustamante
Clinger
Coleman (MO)
Dornan (CA)
Ford (TN)
Hawkins
Martin (NY)

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendments were rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1640

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: On page 64, strike everything between line 1 and line 4.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment need not take very long, but the Members may want to understand what it is.

Mr. Chairman, the House has decided by a fairly narrow vote that we did

not want to eliminate all of the money that was in there for the legislative appropriations. I think perhaps, though, the House may want to decide that what we will do is take out the money that is in the bill under a category called "Official Mailing Costs."

That is the frank. That is additional money for the frank that is in the bill. It is \$12 million.

What this amendment does is it cuts out that money.

Why cut out that money? That is the equivalent, that is approximately the equivalent of all of us deciding that in these times of national financial emergency, when deficits are running big, that we ought to make the ultimate sacrifice and give up one newsletter for all of us.

In other words, the only sacrifice that this amendment would ask of us is that all of us maybe give up one newsletter in order to save \$12 million and thereby maybe help a little bit in meeting the national problem of finances.

That is the essence of the amendment. You can save \$12 million here by cutting out this particular spending. As I say, it is the equivalent of one newsletter apiece. I think maybe the American people might think that is a sacrifice that the Congress can make, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I did not expect such an amendment because it is clearly just a piece of mischief, and I mean no disrespect to its author.

I hope the Members understand what the gentleman has just said. He has quite honestly explained that the only way to comply with this, the effect of adopting his amendment is to reduce the amount of mail you send to your constituents.

Now, if indeed all the mail was generated from our side of the correspondence stream, that is something that would be within our control. But I think almost all of the Members would agree with me that the demands on you and your staff for responses now from citizens and organized groups of citizens, everybody has their computer, is greater than ever in the history of this country. And I do not think your constituents or mine would appreciate it if we gave them the excuse, "I would like to answer your letter but we decided that it is not important for us to send information to you anymore because we are going to balance the budget."

I do not think that is going to buy any votes and I do not think that they are going to look at it as anything except a dodge, as a way to keep from being responsive to them.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to make the point to the membership that we are hardly cutting out our ability to send mail out under this particular amendment. There are millions of dollars in the regular appropriation for the frank, and we are cutting out with this amendment add-on franking money.

I think that is a sacrifice we can afford to make, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I would like to explain the situation we are in, because it is very easy to get caught up in the emotion of the moment and perhaps adopt an amendment that will not make sense in retrospect.

First of all we are not voting here on whether or not the Members mail one less newsletter. That is not the decision before us. It is not the amendment. We are not in a position to govern how many newsletters Members send.

Second, we are here for one major reason, and that is that we did not have the foreknowledge, any more than we knew the exact amount of the January cost-of-living adjustment when we adopted the legislative bill last June, to anticipate what the Federal Postal Commission would require us to reimburse them for the cost of handling our mail. We had a rate increase this past February, remember? The Members should be aware that the rate increase that impacted our constituents also impacted our mail.

So it is necessary for us to provide additional funding to pay these additional postage costs and for the increasing amount of mail that we are responsible for answering.

We have seen increases of 30 percent in our incoming mail from 1 year to the next, and if you do not think this is going to be one of those years, in light of the tax bill that is before us, in light of the variety of budget cuts that we are being asked to deal with, if you do not think this is going to be one of those years in which the incoming mail increases in volume, you are going to be very wrong.

I would urge the Members to keep in mind that this is the responsible way to handle this job. I do believe there are some economies that can be made in the postal area. I am working with our leaders, with the members of the Franking Commission, to find out how we can go about doing that in a rational way.

But each of us have different districts, different committee assignments. We are not in a position to be

treated equally, unless we can come up with some sort of a formula related to population or registration or a number of other factors.

The Ways and Means Committee is going to get far more mail than other committees with less important legislation in this particular fiscal year. Other committees and all the Members will feel the pressures of the additional mail and constituent interest.

I would urge the Members to think about the fact that they have found it very helpful for them to communicate with their constituencies and in more and more cases in response to pressure from them. That is what this mail money is for.

I would urge a responsible no vote on this very, very impetuous amendment.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I will be happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. OAKAR. Is it your understanding that the thrust of this amendment is to inhibit us from responding to our constituents? Is that correct?

Mr. FAZIO. Absolutely; there is no question that will be the effect, and it will fall unevenly among the Members, and I think that is the most pernicious aspect of the amendment.

Ms. OAKAR. I think that our people in this country want to have a closer tie with what we are doing, not to be cut off from communications. So I certainly support a no vote on this amendment.

Mr. FAZIO. I think many Members have decided it is useful to use the television cameras here in the Chamber, and that can be an expensive proposition as well.

Ms. OAKAR. That is a very expensive proposition.

Mr. FAZIO. I think that the time honored and traditional approach of using the mail is what we should sustain.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Is it not true that the volume of incoming mail which we ought to be responding to has increased by 30 percent?

Mr. FAZIO. Those are the statistics that I put in the RECORD when we took the bill up initially. A 30-percent increase is a sizable increase and we can anticipate more. It would be irresponsible for us not to be in a position to respond.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the requisite number of words.

I think it is very important that the Members understand precisely what this amendment would do. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is designed to

strike \$11,853,000 from the supplemental appropriation bill from our mailing costs.

□ 1650

Now Members we should understand that the mailing we are talking about is the mailing we have already done, that we finished mailing as of December 1984. The gentleman [Mr. WALKER] is suggesting we have already sent the mail so it is OK to cut the supplemental out. I understand where the gentleman from Pennsylvania is coming from, but it seems to me if he is serious about this that he would address himself to the 1986 budget year, design a bill that would say that "you and others cannot mail as much as you want," if he likes. But I would point out that in 1986, for example, I mentioned in the general debate, in 1986 as a result of that quote on television "Write to Rosty" we will probably receive millions more letters next year and we cannot anticipate what that load will be 2 years ahead of time. Therefore the supplemental process in this bill.

The gentleman's objective is to suggest that we ought to reevaluate what we are doing with the mail in this House. Frankly, I have just become a member of the Franking Commission and the reason for being there is to try to join with people like our colleague, Mr. UDALL of Arizona, to see if we can get a handle on this thing. But please recognize that we do have a responsibility to pay the bills for the services we have already demanded. Indeed, the mail load was much higher last year than we anticipated in 1983. We have to pay for those bills for the mail already sent. So I ask for a no vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments to chapter IX?

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER X

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

The "Limitation on working capital fund" is reduced to \$65,470,000.

COAST GUARD

ALTERATION OF BRIDGES

For an additional amount for "Alteration of bridges", \$8,400,000, to remain available until expended.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION OPERATIONS

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Transportation shall hereafter, in consultation with appropriate law enforcement and other agencies, reexamine immediately the fitness of any carrier which has violated laws and regulations of the United States pertaining to the illegal importation of controlled substances or has failed to adopt available measures to prevent the illegal importation of controlled substances into the United States aboard its aircraft, and shall, where appropriate, suspend, modify, or revoke the certificate of public convenience and necessity or foreign air carrier permit of such carrier.

The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall not implement or enforce Federal Aviation Administration Order numbered 6850.26A or any other order establishing national policy for Federal funding of visual glideslope indicators until such time as the Administrator has published notice in the Federal Register and has provided adequate opportunity for public comment concerning a national policy for Federal funding of such indicators.

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT (AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND) (RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$10,000,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
LIMITATION ON GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES
The limitation on General operating expenses is reduced to \$204,452,000.

**RAILROAD-HIGHWAY CROSSINGS
DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS**
For an additional amount for "Railroad-highway crossings demonstration projects", to remain available until expended, \$5,300,000, of which \$3,533,333 shall be derived from the Highway Trust Fund.

**MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY
(RESCISSION)**
Of available funds under this head, \$164,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

**NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY
ADMINISTRATION
OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH
(RESCISSIONS)**

Of available funds under this head, \$808,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

Of available funds under this head for the purposes of carrying out a national program to encourage the use of automobile safety belts and passive restraints, \$7,500,000 or so much thereof as may be available on May 2, 1985, is rescinded.

**HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY GRANTS
(RESCISSION)**
Of available funds under this head, \$250,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

**FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION
RAILROAD RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
(RESCISSION)**

Of available funds under this head, \$170,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

RAIL SERVICE ASSISTANCE (INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for "Rail service assistance", \$60,281,000, to remain available until expended, for payment to the Secretary of Treasury for debt reduction, together with such sums as may be necessary for the payment of interest due to the Secretary of Treasury under the terms and conditions of such debt.

Of available funds under this head, \$90,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

SETTLEMENTS OF RAILROAD LITIGATION

For the settlement of promissory notes pursuant to section 210(f) of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 (Public Law 93-236) as amended, \$4,233,000 to remain available until expended, together with such sums as may be necessary for the payment of interest due to the Secretary of Treasury under the terms and conditions of such notes.

NORTHEAST CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$200,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

RAILROAD REHABILITATION AND IMPROVEMENT FINANCING FUNDS

The limitation on total commitments to guarantee new loans pursuant to section 511 through 513 of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-210), as amended, is increased to \$6,500,000 of contingent liabilities for loan principal during fiscal year 1985.

St. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES
The limitation on administrative expenses is reduced to \$1,792,000.

RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS (TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Research and special programs", \$425,000, to be derived by transfer from "Payments to air carriers, Department of Transportation".

RELATED AGENCIES

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$3,150,000.

PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION CAPITAL OUTLAY (TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Capital outlay", \$2,220,000 to be derived from "Operating expenses" and to remain available until expended.

PAYMENTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA (TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For payment to the Republic of Panama, pursuant to article XIII, paragraph 4(c) of the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977, \$2,186,000 to be derived from "Operating expenses".

Mr. WHITTEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that chapter X be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any points of order against chapter X?

Are there any amendments to chapter X?

The Clerk will read.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair has asked if there are any amendments to chapter X.

Hearing no requests, the Clerk will read.

Mr. CONTE. Reserving a point of order, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] wanted to reserve a point of order on page 65, I believe, on the bottom there.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Would the gentleman from Massachusetts indicate what he is trying to indicate to the Chair?

Mr. CONTE. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] made a request.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order on page 65.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I think that chapter has been passed already.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is making the point of order that the chapter has already been passed in the reading and that no one raised a timely point of order; is that the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. It is, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does anyone contest that point?

If not, the Chair will sustain the gentleman's point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER XI

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$969,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$75,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$10,000,000.

Of available funds under this head, \$972,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

INTEREST ON UNINVESTED FUNDS

For "Interest on uninvested funds" for a deficiency incurred in 1984, \$5,000: *Provid-*

ed, That any funds refunded by the American Printing House for the Blind, as a result of an accidental overpayment to the Printing House of \$5,000 in 1984, shall be returned to the General Fund.

BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO AND FIREARMS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$1,900,000.

Of available funds under this head, \$397,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$2,800,000, including purchase of thirty motor vehicles for police-type use.

Of available funds under this head, \$1,223,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

CUSTOMS FORFEITURE FUND

For necessary expenses of the Customs Forfeiture Fund, not to exceed \$6,000,000, as authorized by Public Law 98-473 and Public Law 98-573, to be derived from deposits in the Fund.

CUSTOMS SERVICES AT SMALL AIRPORTS

Such sums as may be necessary for expenses of the provision of Customs services at certain small airports designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, including expenditures for the salaries and expenses of individuals employed to provide such services, to be derived from fees collected by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 236 of Public Law 98-573 for each of these airports, and to remain available until expended.

BUREAU OF THE MINT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$87,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$52,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$198,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

PROCESSING TAX RETURNS AND EXECUTIVE

DIRECTION

(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$781,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

EXAMINATIONS AND APPEALS

(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$1,588,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

INVESTIGATION, COLLECTION, AND TAXPAYER

SERVICE

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for "Investigation, collection and taxpayer service", \$2,400,000, including purchase of twenty-five motor vehicles for police-type use.

Of available funds under this head, \$1,633,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

FEDERAL TAX LIEN REVOLVING FUND

For additional capital for the "Federal Tax Lien Revolving Fund", \$9,000,000.

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$4,400,000.

Of available funds under this head, \$1,465,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

PAYMENT TO THE POSTAL SERVICE FUND

For an additional amount for "Payment to the Postal Service Fund", for revenue foregone on free and reduced rate mail pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 2401 as amended, \$168,620,000.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE

PRESIDENT

NATIONAL CRITICAL MATERIALS COUNCIL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the National Critical Materials Council, including activities as authorized by Public Law 98-373, \$200,000.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION FEDERAL BUILDINGS FUND

LIMITATIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF REVENUE

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

In addition to the aggregate amount heretofore made available for real property management and related activities in fiscal year 1985, \$31,033,000 shall be made available for such purposes and shall remain available until expended for the construction and acquisition of facilities, as follows:

New Construction:

California: Long Beach, Federal Building, \$22,617,000.

Payment of Construction Claims:

Florida: Fort Lauderdale, Federal Building-Courthouse, \$405,000.

South Carolina: Columbia, Federal Building-Courthouse, \$820,000.

District of Columbia: Washington, Forrestal Building, \$3,000,000.

Purchase:

Acquisition of Excess Property, Scotia, New York, Depot, \$3,000,000.

Repairs and Alterations:

Texas: Lufkin, Federal Building, \$1,108,000.

Provided, That \$3,000,000 of the amount previously appropriated for Real Property Operations pursuant to Public Law 98-473, under the heading "Federal Buildings Fund, Limitations on Availability of Revenue", shall be made available for purchase of the Scotia, New York, Depot and the limitation on the amount available for repairs and alterations is increased to \$221,809,000 and the limitation on the amount available for design and construction services is increased to \$59,596,000 and the limitation on the amount available for real property operations is decreased to \$689,899,000: *Provided further*, That any revenues, collections, and any other sums accruing to this fund during fiscal year 1985 in excess of \$2,284,313,000, excluding reimbursements under section 210(f)(6) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 490(f)(6)), shall remain in the fund and shall not be available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriations Acts.

Of available funds under this head, \$3,204,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

PERSONAL PROPERTY ACTIVITIES

PERSONAL PROPERTY, OPERATING EXPENSES (RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$300,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

GENERAL SUPPLY FUND

(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$30,848,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

FEDERAL PROPERTY RESOURCES ACTIVITIES OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL PROPERTY RESOURCES

SERVICE

(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$207,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

EXPENSES, DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS REAL AND RELATED PERSONAL PROPERTY

(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$1,832,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

GENERAL ACTIVITIES

GENERAL MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$403,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION RESOURCES MANAGEMENT OPERATING EXPENSES, OFFICE OF INFORMATION RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$45,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

FEDERAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS FUND

(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$415,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING FUND

(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$145,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$35,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE STAFF FOR FORMER PRESIDENTS

(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$19,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$8,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS

ADMINISTRATION

OPERATING EXPENSES

(RESCISSION)

Of available funds under this head, \$166,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

The limitation on administrative expenses for the retirement and insurance programs to be transferred from the appropriate trust funds of the Office of Personnel Management, contained in (H.R. 5798) and incorporated in Public Law 98-473, is hereby reduced to \$50,503,000.

Of available funds under this head, \$1,161,000 are rescinded pursuant to section 2901 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For an additional amount for "Payment to Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund", \$40,965,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

None of the funds appropriated under this or any other Act shall be obligated or expended prior to October 1, 1985, to implement, promulgate, administer, enforce, or reissue or revise the proposed Office of Personnel Management regulations and the proposed Federal Personnel Manual issuances published in the Federal Register on March 30, 1983, on pages 13341 through 13381, as superseded by proposed regulations and Federal Personnel Manual issuances published in the Federal Register on July 14, 1983, on pages 32275 through 32312, and as further superseded by proposed regulations and Federal Personnel Manual issuances published in the Federal Register on October 25, 1983, on pages 49462 through 49498.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to plan, implement, or administer (1) any reduction in the number of regions, districts or entry processing locations of the United States Customs Service; or (2) any consolidation or centralization of duty assessment or appraisal functions of any offices of the United States Customs Service.

Mr. WHITTEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that chapter XI be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any points of order against chapter XI?

Are there any amendments to chapter XI?

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to take this opportunity to commend the members of the subcommittee for a very important provision that they have added to this bill to save the Customs Service from dismantlement. The bill contains a much needed prohibition against any plan to reduce the number of Customs officers or to degrade the level of service. This will be very good news, of course, to a great many inland ports throughout the United States where the Customs Service offices had been marked for closure. Congress on several occasions has tried repeatedly to prevent the ad-

ministration from wreaking this kind of economic havoc upon the backs of communities dependent upon international trade. One of those is the Dallas-Fort Worth area and there are many others throughout the United States, some 22 of them in all, that would have been affected.

This surely is harmonious with the actions of the budget resolution that we already adopted in the House, where, in a bipartisan way, we decided that we wanted to increase the number of Customs personnel by some 800 slots. This will assist us in our efforts to control illicit narcotics and other illegal traffic. It will protect our borders and if we are ever going to crack down on illegal imports we surely are going to have to be serious about beefing up this Customs Service.

There are an estimated 18,000 outlawed drug flights that violate our border each year. Smugglers have been able to enter the United States almost with impunity by land and by sea. The General Accounting Office estimates that all Federal law enforcement agencies, including Customs Service, have been seizing only an estimated 16 percent of the marijuana and less than 10 percent of the cocaine and heroin that enter this country illegally every year. The Customs Service at its present level of staffing intercepts only 1 out of every 100 planes and only 6 out of every 100 boats that are used for smuggling drugs.

So I commend the committee and I think all of us should join them.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I thank the gentleman for his work and diligence in this Customs area. I have worked a good deal with the gentleman in this area. As the gentleman knows, in the Dallas-Fort Worth area we have in addition to the problems an opportunity, as the gentleman cited, we have some additional concerns in which our concerns are related specifically, in addition to the one the gentleman cited, to the need to provide the services to international trade which at least in our particular Customs district is increasing rather dramatically.

In our area, as the majority leader knows, the private sector is combining with the Customs to ensure in the future we can build the kind of efficiencies through automation, that will ultimately relieve the need to have this kind of prohibition in future appropriations bills at some point in the future.

I commend the gentleman for his work on that efficiency as well as the narcotics control which he cited.

□ 1700

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to commend the gentleman for his comments and for the work of the committee in providing for extra funding for an agency that is doing very important and critical work in our war against narcotics. We need this now more than ever, and I hope that my colleagues will be supportive of the entire appropriations bill, but particularly this provision.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill.

Chapter XI, title I, and title II of this bill are both good sections which address a serious problem adversely affecting every sector of our society. I want to commend our chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL] for his leadership in crafting it.

The supplemental appropriations for the Department of the Treasury provides \$600,000 in funds above the administration's request for 120 additional customs inspectors. And, it provides \$6 million more in funding for salaries and expenses for the Customs Service in order that the Service can avoid absorbing the full cost of the January pay increase.

Mr. Chairman, our Nation is a nation plagued with the disease of drug abuse. There is not a community or school which has been left unscarred. And while the administration and we in Congress have acknowledged the problem and attempted to make provisions to curtail the flow of narcotics into our country, we have seriously neglected our front line of defense against the scourge of drugs, the U.S. Customs Service. In essence, over the last 5 years, we have built a Maginot line through commissions and investigations, all well intentioned, but we continue to lose the war. During all this time, we have been preoccupied with fighting back administration attempts to reduce Customs personnel instead of realizing that those personnel are severely understaffed. In hearings before the subcommittee we found that Customs personnel check only 2 percent of containerized shipments entering the United States. Two out of one hundred sounds like pretty good odds to the drug smuggler.

This bill reverses that trend by providing \$600,000 for 120 Customs personnel to fill immediate shortages, and \$6 million to fund the full cost of the January 1985 Federal pay increase. While the 120 positions are greatly needed, particularly along the United States-Mexican border region, the additional \$6 million pay supplemental will allow the Customs Service to avert

a severe shortage in hiring, under the amount approved by Congress last year. In testimony before the subcommittee, the Customs Service admitted that it would fall short of the congressionally mandated level of personnel by some 525 positions in fiscal year 1985. The sole reason given was that the agency would have to absorb half the cost of the January 1985 pay increase. This is not a new problem. In fiscal year 1983 Customs fell 594 positions short of the positions appropriated. In fiscal year 1982 the figure was 276, and in fiscal year 1981 it was 544. What has happened, is that while the Congress has fought off attempts by the administration to reduce the Customs Service in regular appropriations, the administration, through the Office of Management and Budget has used a backdoor method of spending cuts to end run the Congress and proceed with the elimination of personnel. It is a simple procedure which must be halted if we are going to get serious about drug abuse. By passing this measure, we will give the Service the necessary funds to meet the Congress' wishes.

If we fail to do so, the Customs Service will be understaffed as a result of questionable management and congressional inaction. The issue here is simple. Either we can approve the funds so that the Customs Service can hire the amount of personnel the Congress mandated, or we can play OMB's game of backdoor cuts and rescissions and allow for the Customs Service to continue to be severely understaffed, which closes our eyes to the tragedy of drugs which is ruining the social fiber of our Nation. Make no mistake about it, this vote will signify whether or not the U.S. House of Representatives is willing to get serious about our drug problem. I urge my colleagues to support passage of this section and the entire bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—INCREASED PAY COSTS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1985

For additional amounts of appropriations for the fiscal year 1985, for increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law as follows:

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

"House leadership offices", \$91,000;
"Salaries, officers and employees", \$1,176,000;
"Committee employees", \$1,012,000;
"Members' clerk hire", \$2,636,000;
"Allowances and expenses", \$669,000;

JOINT ITEMS

"Joint Economic Committee", \$75,000;
"Joint Committee on Printing", \$8,000;
"Capitol Guide Service", \$10,000;

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$123,000;

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Office of the Architect of the Capitol:
"Salaries", \$75,000;
"Capitol buildings", \$100,000;
"Capitol grounds", \$100,000;
"House office buildings", \$123,000;
"Capitol power plant", \$70,000;
Library buildings and grounds: "Structural and mechanical care", \$90,000;

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

"Salaries and expenses", \$1,833,000;
Copyright Office: "Salaries and expenses", \$199,000;
Congressional Research Service: "Salaries and expenses", \$500,000;

BOTANIC GARDEN

"Salaries and expenses", \$36,000;

OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

"Salaries and expenses", \$143,000;

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

"Salaries and expenses", \$87,000;

UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

"Salaries and expenses", \$98,000 to remain available until September 30, 1986;

COURT OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

"Salaries of judges", \$1,910,000 of which \$210,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1986;

"Salaries of supporting personnel", \$9,150,000 to remain available until September 30, 1986;

"Defender services", \$375,000 to remain available until September 30, 1986;
"Bankruptcy Courts: Salaries and expenses", \$2,540,000;

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

"Salaries and expenses", \$452,000 to remain available until September 30, 1986;

FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER

"Salaries and expenses", \$90,000;

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$204,000;

EXECUTIVE RESIDENCE AT THE WHITE HOUSE

"Operating expenses", \$57,000;

SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT

"Salaries and expenses", \$13,000;

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$68,000;

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

"Salaries and expenses", \$352,000;

"Office of Federal Procurement Policy: Salaries and expenses", \$15,000;

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

"Office of the Secretary", \$65,000;
"Departmental Administration", for budget and program analysis, \$45,000; for personnel, finance and management, operations, information resources management, equal opportunity, small and disadvantaged business utilization, and administrative law judges and judicial officer, \$175,000; making a total of \$220,000;

"Office of Governmental and Public Affairs", for public affairs, \$40,000; and for intergovernmental affairs, \$2,000;

"Office of the Inspector General", \$431,000 to be derived by transfer from the

appropriation "Food stamp program" and merged with this appropriation;

"Office of the General Counsel", \$188,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Food Stamp Program" and merged with this appropriation;

"Agricultural Research Service", \$4,084,000;

"National Agricultural Library", \$64,000;

STATISTICAL REPORTING SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$538,000;

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$489,000;

"Agricultural Cooperative Service", \$36,000;

"World Agricultural Outlook Board", \$34,000;

"Foreign Agricultural Service", \$274,000;

"General Sales Manager", not to exceed an additional \$54,000 may be transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation funds to support the General Sales Manager;

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

"Administrative and operating expenses", \$502,000;

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$324,000;

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$8,046,000;

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

"Conservation operations", \$8,196,000;

"River basin surveys and investigations", \$252,000;

"Watershed planning", \$172,000;

"Watershed and flood prevention operations", \$1,543,000;

"Resource conservation and development", \$320,000;

"Great Plains conservation program", \$216,000;

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$2,266,000;

FEDERAL GRAIN INSPECTION SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$58,000;

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

"Marketing services", \$841,000;

"Increase in limitation on administrative expenses", \$753,000;

"Funds for strengthening markets, income and supply (section 32)", (increase of \$150,000 in limitation, "marketing agreements and orders");

"Office of Transportation", \$27,000;

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$11,396,000;

FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

"Food program administration", \$1,000,000;

"Human Nutrition Information service", \$37,000;

"Packers and Stockyards Administration", \$85,000;

FOREST SERVICE

"Forest research", \$964,000;

"State and private forestry", \$209,000;

"National forest system", \$10,688,000;

"Construction", \$1,777,000, to remain available until expended;

"Land acquisition", \$30,000, to remain available until expended;

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

"Operations, research, and facilities", \$2,783,000 to be derived by transfer from

International Trade Administration, "Operations and Administration";

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

MILITARY PERSONNEL

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

"Military personnel, Army", \$442,249,000;

"Military personnel, Navy", \$224,819,000, and in addition, to be derived by transfer,

\$114,814,000, of which \$21,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Aircraft Procurement, Navy, 1983/1985", \$27,750,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Weapons Procurement, Navy, 1983/1985", \$51,064,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 1981/1985", and

\$15,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Other Procurement, Navy, 1983/1985";

"Military personnel, Marine Corps", \$116,840,000;

"Military personnel, Air Force", \$275,312,000, and in addition, to be derived by transfer, \$112,367,000, of which

\$72,367,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, 1983/1985", \$25,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Missile Procurement, Air Force, 1983/1985", and \$15,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Other Procurement, Air Force, 1983/1985";

"Reserve personnel, Navy", \$26,619,000;

"Reserve personnel, Marine Corps", \$3,078,000;

"Reserve personnel, Air Force", \$2,976,000;

"National Guard personnel, Air Force", \$17,532,000;

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

"Operation and maintenance, Army", \$14,470,000, and in addition, to be derived by transfer, \$147,000,000, of which \$12,500,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Aircraft Procurement, Army, 1983/1985", \$23,500,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Missile Procurement, Army, 1983/1985", \$86,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army, 1983/1985", \$10,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Procurement of Ammunition, Army, 1983/1985", and \$15,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Other Procurement, Army, 1983/1985";

"Operation and maintenance, Navy", \$22,952,000, and in addition, to be derived by transfer, \$135,148,000, of which \$83,448,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 1981/1985", \$16,200,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Research Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy, 1985/1986", \$29,100,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 1985/1989", and \$6,400,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Aircraft Procurement, Navy, 1985/1987";

"Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps", \$8,488,000 to be derived by transfer from "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 1981/1985";

"Operation and maintenance, Air Force", \$75,133,000, to be derived by transfer from "Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, 1983/1985";

"Operation and maintenance, Defense Agencies", \$89,230,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Army Reserve", \$7,336,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Navy Reserve", \$600,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve", \$150,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Air Force Reserve", \$7,300,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard", \$13,194,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard", \$15,091,000;

"National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, Army", \$12,000;

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

CEMETERIAL EXPENSES, ARMY

"Salaries and expenses", \$53,000;

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

"General investigations", \$2,200,000 to remain available until expended to be derived from "Construction, general";

"General expenses", \$3,000,000 to remain available until expended to be derived from "Construction, General";

SOLDIERS' AND AIRMEN'S HOME

"Operation and maintenance", \$324,000;

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ENERGY PROGRAMS

"Energy Information Administration", \$495,000;

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission: "Salaries and expenses", \$1,627,000;

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$3,535,000;

HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

"Indian Health Services", \$9,297,000;

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

"Salaries and expenses", \$2,712,000, to be derived by transfer from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration;

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

"Management of lands and resources", \$2,000,000;

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

"Resource Management", \$2,000,000;

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

"Operation of the national park system", \$8,700,000;

OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT

"Regulation and technology", \$455,000;

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

"Surveys, investigations, and research", \$4,464,000;

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

"Operation of Indian programs", \$5,000,000;

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

"Office of the Solicitor", \$306,000;

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$1,068,000;

UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$160,000;

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

"Salaries and expenses, General Legal Activities", \$3,308,000;

"Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division", \$665,000;

"Salaries and expenses, United States Attorneys and Marshals", \$7,811,000, of which

\$1,636,000 to be derived by transfer from "Support of U.S. Prisoners";

"Salaries and expenses, Community Relations Service", \$135,000, of which \$17,000 may be made available for expenses necessary under section 501(c) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980;

INTERAGENCY LAW ENFORCEMENT

"Organized crime drug enforcement", \$43,000;

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$15,270,000;

DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$4,682,000;

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$9,561,000;

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

"Salaries and expenses", \$7,345,000;

"Limitation on administrative and vocational training expenses, Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated" (increase of \$30,000 in the limitation on Administrative expenses, and \$74,000 on Vocational Training expenses);

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION

"Black Lung Disability Trust Fund", \$176,000 which shall be available for transfer to Employment Standards Administration, "Salaries and expenses";

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

(TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

"Operations", \$3,112,000, of which \$2,025,000 shall be derived from the unobligated balances of "Payments to air carriers"; \$682,000 shall be derived from "Headquarters administration"; and \$405,000 shall be derived from the unobligated balances of "Construction, Metropolitan Washington airports";

"Operation and maintenance, Metropolitan Washington airports", \$505,000 to be derived from the unobligated balances of "Construction, Metropolitan Washington airports";

COAST GUARD

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

"Operating expenses", \$3,275,000 to be derived from the unobligated balances of "Payments to air carriers": *Provided*, That not to exceed \$782,200,000 shall be available in fiscal year 1985 for compensation and benefits of military personnel of the Coast Guard;

"Reserve training", \$1,025,000, of which \$390,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Payments to air carriers"; \$500,000 shall be derived from the unobligated balances of "Acquisition, construction and improvements"; and \$135,000 shall be derived from the unobligated balances of "Research, development, test and evaluation";

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

"Operations and training", \$552,000 to be derived from the unobligated balances of "Payments to air carriers";

RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

"Research and special programs", \$300,000 to be derived from the unobligated balances of "Payments to air carriers";

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

"Salaries and expenses", \$65,000 to be derived by transfer from "Transportation planning, research and development" together with \$435,000 from the unobligated balances available under this head at the beginning of fiscal year 1985;

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Salaries and expenses", \$657,000;

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER

"Salaries and expenses", \$102,000;

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$1,229,000;

BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO AND FIREARMS

"Salaries and expenses", \$1,339,000;

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$12,492,000;

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

"Administering the public debt", \$849,000;

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$1,821,000;

"Processing tax returns", \$14,384,000;

"Examinations and appeals", \$28,539,000;

"Investigation, collection, and taxpayer service", \$20,453,000;

Any appropriation made available to the Internal Revenue Service for the current fiscal year by this Act may be transferred to any other Internal Revenue Service appropriation to the extent necessary for increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law;

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$2,214,000;

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

"Salaries and expenses", \$5,423,000;

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL BUILDINGS FUND

LIMITATION OF AVAILABILITY OF REVENUE

In addition to the aggregate amount heretofore made available for real property management and related activities in fiscal year 1985, \$2,099,000 shall be available for such purposes and the limitation on the amount available for design and construction services is increased to \$59,513,000 and the limitation on the amount available for real property operations is decreased to \$692,899,000 and the limitation on the amount available for program direction and centralized services is increased to \$118,509,000: *Provided*, That \$2,099,000 of the amount previously appropriated for Real Property Operations pursuant to Public Law 98-473, under the heading "Federal Building Fund, Limitations on Availability of Revenue", shall be made available for increased pay costs: *Provided further*, That any revenues and collections and any other sums accruing to this fund during fiscal year 1985, excluding reimbursements under section 210(f)(6) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 490(f)(6)), in excess of \$2,256,180,000 shall remain in the fund and shall not be available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriations Acts;

PERSONAL PROPERTY ACTIVITIES

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

"Operating expenses", \$2,200,000 of which \$200,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Operating expenses, Office of Information

Resources Management", \$1,500,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Expenses, Presidential transition", and \$500,000 shall be derived from unobligated balances available from "Operating expenses, Federal Property Resources Service";

GENERAL MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

"Salaries and expenses", \$2,200,000 of which \$200,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Operating expenses, Office of Information Resources Management", \$1,500,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Expenses, Presidential transition", and \$500,000 shall be derived from unobligated balances available from "Operating expenses, Federal Property Resources Service";

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

"Research and program management", \$21,300,000;

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

"Salaries and expenses", \$917,000 in addition to \$448,000 for current fiscal year administration expenses for the retirement and insurance programs to be transferred from the appropriate trust funds of the Office of Personnel Management in amounts to be determined by the Office of Personnel Management without regard to other statutes;

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

"Medical care", \$152,524,000, to remain available until September 30, 1986;

"General operating expenses", \$6,000,000;

OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

"Salaries and expenses", \$12,000;

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

"Salaries and expenses", \$2,000;

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

"Salaries and expenses", \$122,000;

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

"Commodity Futures Trading Commission", \$272,000;

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$2,900,000;

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$1,830,000;

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$116,000;

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

"Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses, Federal Home Loan Bank Board" (increase of \$1,110,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses);

FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY

"Salaries and expenses", \$167,000;

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$234,000;

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$1,450,000;

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY STAFF

"Intelligence Community Staff", \$174,000;

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

"Salaries and expenses", \$17,000;

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION
 "Salaries and expenses", \$2,000;
 SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION
 "Salaries and expenses", \$2,000;
 INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
 "Salaries and expenses", \$300,000;
 INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION
 "Salaries and expenses", \$500,000;
 MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD
 "Salaries and expenses", \$194,000;
 "Office of Special Counsel", \$44,000;
 NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION
 "Salaries and expenses", \$22,000;
 NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
 "Research and related activities", (increase of \$1,670,000 in the limitation on program development and management);
 "United States Antarctic program activities", \$750,000, to remain available until expended;
 NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD
 "Salaries and expenses", \$199,000;
 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
 "Salaries and expenses", \$18,000;
 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,294,000;
 SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION
 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,906,000;
 "Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art", \$363,000;
 "Salaries and expenses, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars", \$16,000;
 UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL
 "United States Holocaust Memorial Council", \$13,000;
 UNITED STATES TAX COURT
 "Salaries and expenses", \$350,000;

Mr. WHITTEN (during the reading).
 Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title II be considered as read printed in the RECORD, and opened to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any points of order to title II?

Are there any amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STUDDS

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STUDDS:
 On page 93, strike lines 8-12, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Operating expenses", \$15,000,000 to be derived from funds available in fiscal year 1985 from the boat safety account; and \$3,275,000 to be derived from the unobligated balances of "Payments to air carriers":
Provided, That not to exceed \$785,000,000 shall be available in fiscal year 1985 for compensation and military benefits of military personnel of the Coast Guard;

Mr. STUDDS (during the reading).
 Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of myself and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee on Coast Guard and Navigation, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. DAVIS.

The effect of the amendment would be to make \$15 million available to the Coast Guard from the boat safety account created last year by the Deficit Reduction Act. In proposing the amendment, we seek merely to fulfill the intent of Congress, as it was expressed last year. Federal law now specifically provides that \$15 million from the boat safety account should be made available annually, beginning, in 1985, for the operating expenses of the Coast Guard. Those funds are not in the account; they are derived not from the General Treasury, but instead from that portion of the Federal Tax on Gasoline that may be attributed to the purchase of motorboat fuel; the money is intended by law to be made available to the Coast Guard; the Coast Guard needs the money but Congress must appropriate the money out of the account before it may be spent. The final step—the actual appropriation of the money—is the purpose of this amendment.

If we do not take this step, the \$15 million will not revert to the General Treasury; rather it will remain in the boat safety account until it is ultimately used for some other purpose related directly or indirectly to recreational boating or to sport fish restoration projects. The issue, then, is not whether this \$15 million raised by user fees on boaters will be spent, but whether it will be spent in accordance with a carefully developed formula spelled out in Federal law.

The amendment does not specify precisely how the Coast Guard is to use the \$15 million. But it is the intent of myself and Mr. Davis that the money be used to help the Coast Guard maintain its past level of operations, especially in the areas of search and rescue and maritime law enforcement. Specifically, we expect that one-third of the money will be used to maintain in full operation the 13 search and rescue stations around the Great Lakes that are presently scheduled for reduction or closure; that sufficient funds will be available to permit the continued use of temporary duty personnel in law enforcement operations in the 7th Coast Guard District, without requiring additional new reductions of personnel from other Coast Guard stations around the country; and that the Coast Guard will be able to maintain a total of 39,150 full time military personnel at least through the end of this fiscal year. This amendment should also permit the Coast Guard to go forward with its plans for contracting services under OMB Circular A-76 in a

more deliberate, equitable, and careful way than has been possible, thus far in 1985.

It is our intent—and our reading of the law—that the \$15 million shall be available until expended, and that adoption of this amendment will have no effect on the allocation of the full \$15 million requested by President Reagan for Coast Guard operating expenses in funds transferred in 1986 from the boat safety account.

I want to emphasize again the effect of this amendment. It does not appropriate new money; it simply releases money already earmarked for Coast Guard operating expenses by Federal law. The effect of the amendment will be to help the Coast Guard continue to do its job in the future as well as it has in the past. It is not an amendment to increase the size of the Coast Guard, or to expand its capabilities. In fact, the 39,150 level we are requesting for military personnel in 1985 represents a slight reduction in the number maintained by the Coast Guard at the end of 1984. The real question raised by this amendment is not whether we are to have a freeze on Coast Guard capabilities; that appears, unfortunately, to be almost inevitable in the short term. The real question is whether we are to have a subfreeze, a subzero budget, for this service. I believe that as a matter of national policy we should make a commitment to keep the Coast Guard at least at its present level of strength. The missions of the Coast Guard—in law enforcement, search and rescue, military preparedness, marine safety, aids to navigation, and environmental protection—are demanding; they are growing in importance each year; and they simply will not be accomplished successfully if we do not give the Coast Guard the resources it needs to accomplish those missions at a level the public expects and the national interest demands.

This amendment will help the Coast Guard; it will not hurt the Federal budget. It is, in short, a perfect amendment, and I hope it will be approved.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUDDS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of my colleagues from Massachusetts and Michigan to provide for a transfer of \$15 million from the boat safety account to the Coast Guard's operating expenses, as authorized by last year's Deficit Reduction Act. The authorization of this transfer was enacted too late to be included in the regular 1985 budget or appropriations bill, and I believe that this is exactly the type of circumstance under which supplements of this sort are appropriate.

These additional funds will permit the Coast Guard to maintain a level of military personnel at a number only slightly lower than the level at the end of fiscal year 1984, rather than declining to significantly lower levels as requested in the 1986 budget. These personnel, and this level of funding for operations, are necessary in order to continue the Coast Guard's critical multimission functions. These funds will permit the continued emphasis on drug interdiction in the Southeastern United States while also supporting continued operations on the Great Lakes and elsewhere throughout the country. I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUDDS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I certainly support the basic intent of the gentleman's amendment. Everyone supports the search and rescue and drug interdiction activities of the Coast Guard. Our committee has been extremely generous in providing appropriations to the Coast Guard for these and other activities. More than three-quarters of a billion dollars in additional unbudgeted appropriations have been provided to the Coast Guard over the past 4 fiscal years.

I am somewhat concerned, however, about where we will find the money in fiscal year 1986 to continue the programs and personnel levels provided for in the gentleman's amendment, particularly if we intend to freeze transportation programs at the current year's level as contemplated in the House budget resolution. Even though the administration's budget for 1986 treats the Coast Guard much more generously than any other major agency in the Department, I cannot guarantee that we will be able to find additional funds for these purposes next year. However, I do recognize the importance of the activities the Coast Guard performs and, as one member of the committee, have no problem taking the gentleman's amendment to conference.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUDDS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for this fine amendment. It is of vital importance to the small community in my district and to all the Great Lakes ports which are adversely affected by the decision of the Coast Guard.

I thank the gentleman for offering it, and I strongly support it.

Mr. ECKART of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUDDS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ECKART of Ohio. I appreciate that. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, and his counterpart, the gentleman from Michigan, for their vigorous efforts in support of Great Lakes search and rescue operations, of critical importance not only economically but safety orientation to the great boating communities on the Great Lakes.

I appreciate and support the amendment.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say while I still have the floor that it is understanding that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] is going to introduce an amendment that is entirely acceptable to both sides, which in fact fulfills the intention of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise to support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as ranking minority member of the Coast Guard Subcommittee and coauthor of this amendment, I would like to take this opportunity to urge my colleagues to support it. What this amendment seeks to do is give the U.S. Coast Guard \$15 million in operating funds which will allow them to do three very important things:

First, it will enable them to keep operating search and rescue stations on the Great Lakes that they intend to close or curtail;

Second, it will allow the Coast Guard to keep up its Drug Interdiction Program in our southeast coastal areas with 100 temporary duty personnel they now have; and,

Third, it will allow the Coast Guard to maintain a personnel level of 39,150 as required by the 1984 Coast Guard Authorization Act.

Before I discuss these provisions I would like to make it very clear to all the Members of the House that this \$15 million we are asking for will not add a penny to the Federal deficit. The funding we seek is available now through the boating safety account of the aquatic resources trust fund passed by Congress last year as part of the Deficit Reduction Act. That account collects up to \$45 million for our Federal Boating Safety Programs. By law, \$15 million of that funding is earmarked for the operating expenses of the Coast Guard. Because the Deficit Reduction Act was passed late in the 98th Congress, there was not an opportunity to appropriate this funding to the Coast Guard in fiscal year 1985. This is what we are attempting to do now.

Having made that assurance to the Members, I would like to discuss our priorities for this funding. First and foremost to me is the continued operation of 13 search and rescue stations

on the Great Lakes which are due for closure or curtailment at the end of this fiscal year. This so-called Great Lakes consolidation plan was submitted as part of the Coast Guard's 1986 budget—but it was not a Coast Guard plan, it was the plan of the Office of Management and Budget. During hearings in February before our Coast Guard Subcommittee on the Coast Guard's 1986 budget, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, Admiral Gracey, admitted to us that the plan was the result of a directive of OMB to cut 150 people from the Great Lakes region. It is a plan that I know the Coast Guard does not like and would not have produced on its own. It is plan which severely reduces the search and rescue capability of the Coast Guard on the Great Lakes. It is a plan which literally endangers recreational boaters—which I might add there are more of in the State of Michigan than any other State in the Nation. Our Coast Guard Subcommittee held hearings in six areas of the Great Lakes region where stations are affected by this plan and heard a loud and unanimous outcry from boaters, sheriff departments and emergency service officers alike. I know that there will be other Members speaking today about the urgency of this problem in our region and I want to emphasize that it is important that this body reject this attempt by OMB to force cutbacks in Coast Guard personnel which are arbitrary and totally unwarranted. That brings me to another priority for this funding.

This Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1984 contains a provision which mandates a floor for the level of Coast Guard military personnel. That floor is 39,150. The reason we put that floor in the bill is simple. For years the Coast Guard has been asked to do more and more with less and less. When we went through the process of authorizing Coast Guard programs it became clear to our committee that if the Coast Guard is to survive it must be able to maintain a minimum number of people to do all the things it has been asked to do—not the least of which is the massive drug interdiction effort this administration has made a priority for the Coast Guard in the Southeast. After careful and thorough consideration, our Coast Guard Subcommittee recommended this minimum number of people which the Coast Guard must have to continue to operate. That recommendation was accepted by Congress and signed into law by the President. Now, OMB has decided the Coast Guard doesn't need this minimum number of people. I say that OMB is not in a position to make that judgment and should not be allowed to by this body.

Lastly, our amendment will allow the Coast Guard to keep the 100 tem-

porary duty personnel they have in the Southeast for the drug interdiction effort. I would like to point out that these 100 people are not extra personnel, they have been sent from other Coast Guard missions in other parts of the Nation. They are an important addition to the drug interdiction effort and we believe they should stay where they are. This amendment will make that possible.

These are the issues which our amendment addresses. Again, we are not asking for extra funding, we are asking for funding which exists right now. We are not asking for frills, we are asking for a freeze. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS. I am pleased to yield to the ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT].

Mr. LENT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUBBS] who is the chairman of the Coast Guard and Navigation Subcommittee, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DAVIS] who is the ranking minority member of that same subcommittee. This amendment in effect accomplishes two important objectives.

First, it achieves the objective of adding \$15 million to the Coast Guard budget so that they may carry out their important duties. Specifically, the intention is to permit the continuation of 13 search and rescue stations on the Great Lakes which are currently scheduled to be cut back, continuation of important drug interdiction activities off southeast Florida without affecting the Coast Guard operations in other parts of the United States where their services are equally important, and maintenance of the level of military personnel in the Coast Guard as required by the Coast Guard Authorization Act passed last Congress. While the Department of Defense is building up its military personnel, the military personnel of the Coast Guard have been cut back. This amendment therefore would prevent this anomaly from occurring.

The second objective is that it fulfills an obligation that Congress made to the recreational boating community. The \$415 million is to be derived from the boating safety part of the Aquatic Resources Trust Fund which was created last year by the Deficit Reduction Act. This money is placed in this account from a tax that recreational boaters pay on motorboat fuel. The money is set aside and earmarked specifically for the Coast Guard, if Congress actually appropriates the money. That is simply the purpose of this amendment.

If not appropriated as promised, the money will not go to support the

Coast Guard, but be spent on sport fishing restoration programs rather than being turned over to the General Treasury. This, it is not a question of whether we will spend \$15 million or not, but rather a question of how this money will be allocated. Allowing this money to pass through this trust fund without being allocated to support the Coast Guard will violate a trust that we in Congress have with the boating community. It also will cause the Coast Guard to make ill-advised cutbacks in its programs which of course will benefit no one.

We constantly turn to the Coast Guard and ask them to do more and more with less and less. At some point, the Coast Guard will not be able to perform the important law enforcement, search and rescue, marine environmental protection, merchant marine safety, military readiness, and other maritime duties that all of us have come to automatically expect from them.

In summary, this amendment gives us the opportunity to add funding to this important agency and meet our obligation to the maritime community without doing any harm to the overall budget. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join with me and support this amendment.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

● Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I fully support and urge passage of this amendment to H.R. 2577, the supplemental appropriations legislation for fiscal year 1985.

As has been stated by the chairman of the Coast Guard and Navigation Subcommittee, we know that \$15 million is necessary to: First, maintain the level of military personnel required by the Coast Guard Authorization Act passed last Congress; second, to permit continuation of 13 search and rescue stations on the Great Lakes; and third, to continue the drug interdiction activities in southeast Florida without reducing essential Coast Guard services in the rest of the country.

I am especially concerned about the continuous reduction of military personnel in the U.S. Coast Guard. As you know, the Government is presently contracting out services to the private sector through the A-76 process. Unfortunately, the Coast Guard has been asked to reduce their personnel levels before they even know if it is cost effective to contract out one of their functions to the private sector. It is important that we do not cut military personnel in anticipation of future reductions in force. Therefore, we need to maintain the level of military personnel, as was required by the Coast Guard Authorization Act passed last year.

And most important, please do not overlook the fact that this \$15 million

is derived from the motor boat fuels tax, paid for by the boaters of this country. It is money that has already been collected and will continue to be collected from the fuel tax on gasoline. This money will not be turned over to the General Treasury. It should be the decision of this House to use these funds for the U.S. Coast Guard. ●

● Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by both the ranking majority and minority members of the Coast Guard Subcommittee. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment which will make possible the continued operation of search and rescue stations around the Great Lakes which, are currently scheduled for closure or consolidation, without adding a penny to the Federal deficit.

In a recent meeting with Coast Guard officials I learned that the proposed closing of the Holland Coast Guard Station in Holland, MI along with eight other stations around the Great Lakes was directed not by the Coast Guard but by the Office of Management and Budget. I also understand that the Office of Management and Budget made the decision to specifically target the Great Lakes region out of a dozen other Coast Guard regions in an effort to slash \$5 million out of the Coast Guard's fiscal 1986 budget.

I consider search and rescue to be the Coast Guard's primary and most important mission. Without the Coast Guard's protection, Lake Michigan can be deadly, particularly during the peak recreational season. Failure to pass this amendment would leave users of Lake Michigan, particularly in the Holland area, virtually unprotected. It would take a rescue boat nearly 2 hours to respond to a call in the Holland area if it has to come all the way from Grand Haven or St. Joseph, MI. In most cases, help would arrive too late.

Thomas D. Martin, director of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources' Office of Great Lakes has said:

These cuts are not only a direct threat to the welfare of recreational boaters, they are a menace to the safety of commercial seamen (both) directly and indirectly * * *.

Whether it is fishermen or commercial seamen, or just recreational boaters out for the fun of it, their safety and sometimes their survival depends on the U.S. Coast Guard's search and rescue service.

Shouldn't we place a higher priority on lifesaving than on money-saving? I urge passage of this amendment. ●

● Mr. ECKART of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to vote in favor of an amendment to the fiscal year 1985 Supplemental Appropriations bill that provides an additional \$15 million to

the U.S. Coast Guard for operating expenses. This amendment addresses 3 specific Coast Guard functions, including prohibiting the slated closure of 13 search and rescue stations along the Great Lakes.

This amendment restored funding for these stations, including Station Ashtabula in my district in northeastern Ohio, that were slated for closure under an Office of Management and Budget proposal, the Great Lakes Consolidation Plan. Under this plan, the Coast Guard was directed to close 13 search and rescue stations, cut \$5 million from the Coast Guard's funding in the Great Lakes, and eliminate 150 jobs. Considering the continued increase in the recreational use of the Great Lakes, this proposal is a great threat to the safety of the many commercial and recreational users of the lakes.

Over these past few months I have worked very closely with my colleague from Michigan to ensure that the OMB's plan is not implemented. We held hearings in Jefferson County, OH to discuss the Reagan administration's plan and to solicit comments from concerned citizens about the closure.

The opposition to the plan closing was expectedly strong. The closure of the station would not only increase the boating deaths near the harbor, because the response time of the Coast Guard from nearby stations would not be adequate, but the economy of the community would be seriously threatened. Many citizens of the town, whose jobs rely on the lake and the activities it provides, worried that boaters would leave Ashtabula and move to towns where a Coast Guard station was operating. In a county, where the unemployment rate is currently 13.8 percent, Station Ashtabula's closing would only increase its hardships.

The services the Coast Guard provides along our sea coasts which are vital to the security, safety, and economy of our Nation, has been consistently slated for cuts by the Reagan administration. I am heartened by my colleague's efforts to reverse these proposals and to continue providing the moneys this necessary service provides, not only to the people of my district in Ohio, but throughout the country. ●

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COUGHLIN TO THE
AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STUDDS

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COUGHLIN to the amendment offered by Mr. STUDDS: After "\$15,000,000" insert the following ", to be available until expended."

Mr. COUGHLIN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I fully support the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Michigan. It is a very good amendment. This simply makes the funds available until they are expended, and since some of the funds may not be necessary until next year, it would carry them over to next year to the extent they are not spent.

I understand this is acceptable to the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments to title II?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: On page 100 on line 21 strike all language after the word "year."

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment would do is say that if this is really a supplemental appropriations bill, that it really is an attempt to meet emergency conditions in the year 1985, the money ought to be spent in fiscal year 1985.

We ought not to be moving the money over into future years, because what this bill really is, if the committee were to be truthful with us is, an appropriations authorization bill going into not only toward the end of 1985, but going into 1986; in some cases going over into 1987.

This bill is an entire panoply of spending that commits us not only for this year, but commits us well into the next year.

Now, what my amendment would do is simply say, have the section 301 read, "No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall remain

available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year." Period.

And so what we would be doing is saying we ought to spend the money in fiscal '85 if we are appropriating in fiscal '85. We ought not use these bills out here as a conglomerate of ways in order to effect spending.

We ought not to have Members of Congress coming in here getting their pet projects put down in these bills and then extending it over into years hence. We ought not allow one committee to make all of the decisions for the House and roll those over into the outyears.

We ought to say in this bill that the money that we are coming up with in supplemental appropriations is available in this year and this year only, and that is what my amendment would do; it would not affect any of the moneys in the bill; it would simply say that the moneys in the bill ought to be expended in this year, since this is a supplemental appropriation for this year.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I listen to lots of mistaken statements on the floor. I have not taken issue at the time they were made, because by stretching out debate, you spend money, too.

I would like to point out that this year, that your Committee on Appropriations has been requested to act. The bill before us, that we brought to you, was \$69 million below the level recommended by the President. As it stands now, it is \$173 million below the amount requested by the President.

The reason for allowing funds to stretch into the next year is the same reason I gave you on Ethiopia in the famine relief bill; let the President stretch it out; it gives him some bargaining power. When you make the Government spend all its money by October the 1st, you have cost yourself money; because if they have time to do it on a proper basis, you will save money.

□ 1710

Now, we have lots of reaction here on the floor that indicates this, that and the other, and I know they have an appeal in tomorrow's paper. Let me tell you that I have addressed this in a formal letter, required by law, to the Budget Committee. This year the budget requests that we cut domestic expenditures \$28.9 billion but it asks that we increase money for military carryover by \$36.2 billion. So none of the money that we are cutting here goes on the deficit or the debt. Keep that straight. Nobody is taking issue

with these facts. I have made it clearly available to you.

Now, I am as much disturbed as anybody about the deficit and the debt. But all of this action that we are taking is not changing spending into deficit reduction. So let us give them time where they can save some money instead of making them commit all the funds in this bill by October 1.

We have been through this many, many times. An amendment like this is just very foolish.

Now, I have no disparaging remarks to say to my friend from Pennsylvania, but we spent hours and months and days on this and we have come here with our best judgment. Now, keep in mind that we need to get our debts settled, we need to get our economy settled, we need to do a whole lot of things. But let us do it judiciously, and let us be sure that we take care of the essentials. There are a whole lot of things that are necessary to run this Government, and we need to look at that. We should balance our budget at a high enough level to take care of what we have.

I mentioned here the other day that some years ago it was said that a particular country had the only balanced budget in the world, did not owe a dollar and did not have one either. So balancing the budget is important, but let us take care of the essentials first.

Here, this amendment, if adopted, would cost you millions of dollars not only in money but in inadequate response to what we spend. So I hope you will defeat this amendment. It is well intentioned but headed the wrong way.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I agree with the chairman. The amendment would affect every chapter in the supplemental. In fact, we just adopted the Coughlin amendment on the Coast Guard, saying if the money was not expended this year, they can expend it next year. So I think, in the long run, we would lose money. I direct my remarks to my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield, here is why I offered the amendment—and I will ask unanimous consent in a moment to withdraw it—but the only reason I offered the amendment is to make a point about supplemental appropriations. Supplemental appropriations are not that any longer. Under the Rules of the House and under procedures in the House, until a few years ago, supplemental appropriations were truly that. We brought out bills here on an emergency basis. This is essentially a continuing resolution with large amounts of money in it for a little bit of every-

thing, going well into out years. And I am questioning the process, because the process is adding on billions of dollars worth of spending. I think that it is high time that we begin to review a process by which we are expending billions of dollars. The amendment is in a way to say that this is a mockery to put language in like this when we know that throughout this bill there is just one huge appropriation into the next year.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 302. Except where specifically increased or decreased elsewhere in this Act, the restrictions contained within appropriations, or provisions affecting appropriations or other funds, available fiscal year 1985, limiting the amount which may be expended for personal services, or for purposes involving personal services, or amounts which may be transferred between appropriations or authorizations available for or involving such services, are hereby increased to the extent necessary to meet increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ZSCHAU

Mr. ZSCHAU. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ZSCHAU: Page 101, after line 6, insert the following new section:

SEC. 303. All amounts appropriated by this Act for payments not required to be paid by previously enacted law shall be reduced by 5 percent.

Mr. ZSCHAU. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would make an across-the-board 5 percent cut in all of the discretionary programs in this supplemental appropriations bill.

I think that this amendment deserves careful consideration. In the last couple of weeks we have had a lot of focus on tax reform. It is an exciting topic, it is a fun topic to talk about, but it has diverted our attention from the effort that we engaged in, in the beginning of this Congress, namely, deficit reduction. It has taken our eye off of the deficit-reduction ball.

Second, as you have read in the newspapers in the last couple of days, there are indications that the rate of economic growth in the country will result in deficits that are higher than previously projected, even if all of the budget-cutting spending cuts enacted in either the Senate bill or the House bill currently in conference were enacted. And it seems to me that at this time we should, when we are considering a \$14 billion spending bill, revitalize our interest in deficit reduction.

The nondefense cuts from program changes in the House-passed bill, the

budget that came out of this body, were a total of \$14.35 billion. That is an amount equal to the amount that we will be spending if this supplemental appropriations bill were passed as it is. It would be a case of easy-come, easy-go, except that it was not easy in order to make those program cuts that would result in a \$14 billion cut in spending in 1986. It seems to me that we should be addressing our attention to that fundamental question today.

Fiscal restraint, I might add, is a state of mind, in addition to actions. It is an attitude. And in the authorization bills that we have passed so far, we have enacted the concept of a freeze, not to increase spending from what it was in the past years. That has been a very healthy attitude that we have had from the standpoint of fiscal responsibility. But, if in this case, we do not seek to apply the same sort of restraints, I believe that it will be more difficult in the future, as we address further authorization bills and appropriations bills, to have that same sort of restraint that we have had so far.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ZSCHAU. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. My chapter of the bill, at least the chapter of the bill that comes out of the subcommittee which I chair, relates in measure to appropriating funds for firefighting expenses. Those are expenses that have already been incurred. They are expenses for fires that have occurred in the gentleman's State of California, all throughout the West, for the most part.

If the 5-percent cut goes to the firefighting expenses, we will have to pass another supplemental in order to pay for that.

Now, I am sure the gentleman never intended that kind of result.

Mr. ZSCHAU. I appreciate the gentleman raising that issue.

The way in which the language of my amendment is offered is that all amounts appropriated by this act for payment not required to be paid by previously enacted law shall be reduced by 5 percent. The mandatory programs, those that are under formula, would be maintained. But the discretionary expenditures would be limited by the 5 percent.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will yield further, this is not a formula program. This is a program that is based upon actual costs that are expended. There is no formula required for law. This is just an accumulation of expenses that have occurred in connection with suppressing fires throughout the West, for the most part, and it has to be paid.

If there is a 5-percent cut, we will have to pass another supplemental

somewhere along the line in order to pay these expenses.

Mr. ZSCHAU. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution, and I think he raises an important question, that these cuts that I am talking about will be difficult. All of these programs are important. But all of the expenditures that we deal with in this body are important and all of the cuts that we will be asked to make as we try to deal with the deficit will be difficult cuts. It seems to me that if we have expended so much time on the budget, we have been spending so much energy in order to bring the deficit down, that this is not a time to change our attitude but a time to revitalize our efforts. A 5-percent cut is a cut only on the margin. It saves only \$371 million. But I think it is an important signal and an important action for this House to take so that in the future, as we dealing with spending issues, we can look back at this appropriation supplemental spending bill and say we took decisive action today, we should take it again in the future.

□ 1720

Mr. FAZIO. I respect the gentleman's perspective on the entire matter of budget reduction and I know he is sincere in his efforts, and I am trying to understand where the amendment would affect the bill and where it would not.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. ZSCHAU] has expired.

(On request of Mr. FAZIO and by unanimous consent, Mr. ZSCHAU was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ZSCHAU. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FAZIO. Would the gentleman's amendment reduce, for example, the funding that we have talked so much about already today in the Foreign Operations section of the bill; the aid to Egypt and Israel, for example?

Mr. ZSCHAU. Yes. Under my amendment the aid to Egypt and Israel, out of the \$2 billion additional aid, it would be reduced by 5 percent or \$100 million. Commodity Credit Corporation, reduced by about \$197 million. Pell grants, \$14 million, and so on. There is a series of discretionary programs that I could go through.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FAZIO. One of the areas that we typically get involved in at this point in the fiscal year is the Food Stamp Program where we do find that, because of lagging employment in some areas of the country with a slow recovery, there continues to be a need to provide basic food for families.

Is the gentleman's amendment reducing the allocations for food stamps in the bill?

Mr. ZSCHAU. I appreciate the gentleman raising that question. There is

a debate among the various committees as to whether the Food Stamp Program falls into the mandatory or discretionary column. For the purposes of my amendment, I assume that the Food Stamp Program was a mandatory program rather than a discretionary program because it is enacted under a formula that is based on previous law. So the \$16 million that would have been cut if it had been applied to the Food Stamp Program is not included in my amendment.

Mr. FAZIO. It is not included?

Mr. ZSCHAU. That is correct.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to commend the gentleman from California. I believe in what he is trying to do to bring Federal spending under control. But any of you who have been around here for any period of time know that I have opposed many across-the-board amendments.

This is a very fragile bill. A few moments ago, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUBBS] offered an amendment to transfer \$15 million out of the aquatic trust fund and into the Coast Guard. Why? I will tell you why. If there is any agency in the Federal Government that is suffering today because of lack of funds it is the Coast Guard of the United States.

The Congress has given the Coast Guard mission after mission without providing adequate resources. The Coast Guard now has search and rescue, fisheries enforcement, and drug interdiction. We all heard about the terrible drug problem and what the Coast Guard is doing in Florida and elsewhere in the Southeastern United States.

The Coast Guard is responsible for pollution enforcement, maritime treaty enforcements, vessel safety, and aids to navigation. They also do ice breaking. That agency is hurting. Believe me, they are really hurting. A 5-percent cut now to the Coast Guard? You must be kidding.

Look at the ICC. The ICC has been so short of funds they have been on furlough since mid-April. They are working 4 days a week, with a 20-percent pay cut. Nine hundred employees down there have only been working 4 days a week because there is no money in the well. And so we put in \$500,000 to bring those people with families and mortgages back to work, and now you are going to cut that 5 percent?

We have money in here for Pell grants. The chairman of the Labor, HHS, and Education Subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky, did such a great job on Pell grants. You are going to cut Pell grants \$14 million? Aid to Egypt, you are going to cut that \$25 million? Aid to Israel, \$75 million? They have a very fragile economy. This was a request by the administration.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. As I pointed out to the gentleman from California, this bill contains \$45 million to repay firefighting costs that have already been incurred. But more than that, this bill contains \$2,900,000 which is an estimated shortfall in welfare assistance for the Indian people. This bill contains an additional \$2 million for the Indian water rights cases to provide funds for the Indian people to defend their rights in the water which is the life blood, not only of the westerners but of the Indian people as well.

It provides an additional \$550,000 to take care of the Zuni Pueblo's water rights negotiations. These are cases that have been pending for years. We have finally put money in to protect the Indian people. This amendment would cut those funds.

Mr. CONTE. As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, the bill also provides for the security of the embassies in the Middle East and the Persian Gulf. The gentleman from Iowa, NEAL SMITH, is an expert on this; he has been through that area; he knows how fragile that situation is out there. The amendment would cut \$13 million for security, and we need that money and we need it desperately. We should have done it years ago.

Mr. ZSCHAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ZSCHAU. There is several millions of dollars for security assistance, but there is also within that line item a building of the U.S. Embassy in the Soviet Union.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] has expired.

(On request of Mr. ZSCHAU and by unanimous consent, Mr. CONTE was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ZSCHAU. The amount of contractor compensation equals the amount that I am taking out of here, so it was my intent not to do anything to undermine our activities in enhancing the security in our embassies abroad.

Mr. CONTE. Let me tell the gentleman that we just came back from the Soviet Union and we are having a lot of trouble building that Embassy over there, believe me. These are claims by American contractors; we own that money. There is no way of getting out of that; they can go to court and sue the Federal Government. You say: You cannot forget it. They are claims; they are owed.

The gentleman from California is well-intentioned. I support his idea, but not here. This is too delicate. I urge him to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I just wanted to say that the gentleman is exactly right. In this State Department supplemental security item, most of the money is for work that needs to be done to protect Americans overseas. The last place you could get that money is to stop paying the claims from U.S. contractors for the Moscow project. The reduction would have to come from one of these projects where we need security work done.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. Solomon and by unanimous consent, Mr. CONTE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SOLOMON. I would like to address a question to the gentleman from California. How do you go about cutting the supplemental by 5 percent? Is that what I understand?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from California for his response.

Mr. ZSCHAU. The 5 percent across-the-board cut would be applied to all of the discretionary programs. Those programs where there is not an obligation to pay the funds under existing law.

□ 1730

Mr. SOLOMON. Let me just say this to the gentleman, and I can understand the concerns on both sides of the aisle, especially those of the gentleman from Massachusetts, for whom I have a great deal of respect, but we have to start someplace. We cannot just go out and spend \$14 billion over and above what we anticipated spending in the first place.

We have a foreign assistance bill coming on this floor sometime this week or next week or the week after, and it is going to be a half a billion dollars over the continuing resolution of last year. We have deficits in this country that are going to drive interest rates sky high.

I can remember not too long ago we had interest rates of 22 percent prime rate. Do you want to see that happen again?

I think the gentleman is offering a good amendment. I intend to offer, when the foreign assistance bill gets on this floor, an amendment which will cut that foreign assistance bill 5 percent in the aggregate, and let the President make those cuts, or let you gentleman make them. I do not care who makes them, but we are going to cut that foreign assistance bill.

When we have people in America who we are asking to tighten their belts because we want to keep inflation down, and we want to keep interest rates down, the only way we are going to do it is to stop spending money, and I support the gentleman's amendment, and every man and woman in this Chamber should support it.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CONTE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. CONTE. First of all, let me answer the gentleman from New York. This supplemental is not something that the Congress or the Appropriations Committee dreamed up. The administration asked for \$13.490 billion in supplementals. If the gentleman is going to offer a 5-percent or 10-percent cut on foreign aid, that is fine if he offers it on defense also, because we have to be consistent here.

This is a supplemental. This is money that is due. You have heard the people here talk about Customs and narcotics flooding over the border in Texas. They need this money desperately in New Mexico and other places.

Where are you going to cut this 5 percent? The Coast Guard, I told you, is already barebones. Fortunately there are some of us who feel strongly about the Coast Guard and its missions, even though you could not get a canoe up my Housatonic River. But I believe in the Coast Guard. How can you cut them 5 percent? This is wrong.

Mr. ZSCHAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from California, because I think he is a reasonable man and he may be coming around to my way of thinking.

Mr. ZSCHAU. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman has illustrated the fundamental problem in all of the appropriation and authorization bills, that the programs are good and it is difficult to make cuts. The arguments are strong and persuasive for all of the expenditures.

But what I am saying is that if we do not make an attempt on this \$14 billion supplemental to exercise some modest amount of restraint, it is going to be very difficult to make the arguments down the road as we go further to exercise the restraint we need to exercise in order to reduce the deficit.

Mr. CONTE. I think we are better off doing it in the regular appropriation bills, or even instead of that, in what the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] suggests, on every authorization bill that comes up here. Then propose your 5-percent cut across the board, but not here. This is a supplemental. We have to pay these bills.

(On request of Mr. NATCHER and by unanimous consent, Mr. CONTE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], the ranking minority member on the Appropriations Committee and the ranking minority member on the subcommittee that makes the recommendations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

He has pointed out to the committee that as far as guaranteed student loans are concerned, it is a budgeted request. It was submitted by the administration and, Mr. Chairman, the administration is right about it. There is a shortage of \$664,846,000, and after the hearings we added \$55.5 million, bringing it up to \$720 million, the amount necessary under the existing law. As far as the Pell Grant Program is concerned, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has pointed out, a maximum grant of \$2,100 is in the budget request for fiscal year 1986. That is included in the President's request in the 1986 budget. That is also what we have in this supplemental bill.

So a 5-percent reduction takes out of this bill millions of dollars, Mr. Chairman, that was not only requested by the administration, but this is money that is needed and I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ZSCHAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from California.

Mr. ZSCHAU. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to clarify that the guaranteed student loan program is considered to be a mandatory program and would not be subject to the 5-percent cut in my amendment. The Pell grants, on the other hand, would be subject to the 5 percent.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have had this type of amendment many times, and it has an appeal. However, I urge my colleagues to stick with the system which we have. I was on the study group that recommended the Budget Act. What we have today is a far cry from what we recommended.

At that time the appropriations bills for 37 out of 39 years had been below the budget. We were proud of being below the budget. We try now. We have weeks and months of hearings by folks who are experienced in this area,

and we bring a bill here and recommend it to you.

We created the Budget Committee because about 42 percent of all our spending was bypassing our annual review process. We were passing laws saying we shall do it, and then we had to pick up the check.

May I say in the Appropriations Committee today, 46 percent of what we have in here the legislative committees have made mandatory, and we are caught with having to do it. But I say listen to this, if you will: This committee has brought you, after weeks and weeks of hearings, where they want to reduce. I served on the Budget Committee the first year when it was what it was supposed to be, that is to set targets, work toward the targets, and then make it final at the end of the year and not at the front of the year. We now try to control Congress based on the opinions of economists. This is what we are trying to do now.

So I repeat again, our system means that we recommend to you our honest views. And may I say already this bill is \$173 million below the recommendations of the President. For the current fiscal year overall, we are \$17 billion below that recommended by the President.

I am telling my colleagues the system works. If you get in the habit of cutting everything 5 percent, they will put 10 percent in and let you cut 5. So I am saying, while your intentions are good, you will disrupt a whole lot of things and you are losing a system where we are doing our very best to stay under the budget.

So I urge my colleagues to vote this down and let the system work—where there are hearings, where there is judgment, where we have a track record that cannot be ignored, in my judgment, as against any individual who does not have the same experience we do. Let us not set up a system where we are forced to bring you something and count on you cutting it out.

Mr. ZSCHAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ZSCHAU. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks that this is a carefully crafted supplemental based upon many hearings and based on the facts, but the facts are changing in this economy. We are facing economic growth that is slower than we had anticipated. We are facing deficits that are larger than we anticipated.

It seems to me that this committee has to take some action, looking ahead to the future as well as the past.

Mr. WHITTEN. I agree that it seems that way to you, but the gentleman's amendment, might contribute to the

waste we read so much about in the papers.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ZSCHAU].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ZSCHAU) there were—ayes 11, noes 30.

Mr. ZSCHAU. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 151]

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—410

Ackerman	Carr	Evans (IL)
Addabbo	Chandler	Fasell
Alexander	Chappell	Fawell
Anderson	Chapple	Fazio
Andrews	Cheney	Feighan
Annuzio	Clay	Fiedler
Anthony	Coats	Fields
Applegate	Cobey	Fish
Archer	Coble	Flippo
Armey	Coleman (TX)	Florio
Aspin	Collins	Foglietta
Atkins	Combest	Foley
AuCoin	Conte	Ford (TN)
Badham	Conyers	Fowler
Barnard	Cooper	Frank
Barnes	Coughlin	Franklin
Bartlett	Courter	Frenzel
Barton	Coyne	Fuqua
Bateman	Craig	Gallo
Bates	Crane	Garcia
Bedell	Crockett	Gaydos
Bellenson	Daniel	Geldenson
Bennett	Dannemeyer	Gekas
Bentley	Darden	Gephardt
Bereuter	Daschle	Gibbons
Berman	Daub	Gilman
Bevill	Davis	Gingrich
Biaggi	de la Garza	Glickman
Billakis	DeLay	Gonzalez
Bliley	Derrick	Goodling
Boehlert	DeWine	Gordon
Boggs	Dickinson	Gradison
Boland	Dicks	Gray (IL)
Boner (TN)	Dingell	Green
Bonior (MI)	DioGuardi	Gregg
Bonker	Dixon	Groberg
Borski	Donnelly	Guarini
Bosco	Dorgan (ND)	Gunderson
Boucher	Dornan (CA)	Hall (OH)
Boulter	Dowdy	Hall, Ralph
Boxer	Dreier	Hamilton
Breaux	Duncan	Hammerschmidt
Brooks	Durbin	Hansen
Broomfield	Dwyer	Hartnett
Brown (CO)	Dymally	Hatcher
Broyhill	Dyson	Hayes
Bruce	Early	Hefner
Bryant	Eckart (OH)	Hefst
Burton (CA)	Eckert (NY)	Hendon
Burton (IN)	Edgar	Henry
Bustamante	Edwards (CA)	Hertel
Byron	Edwards (OK)	Hiller
Callahan	Emerson	Hillis
Campbell	English	Holt
Carney	Erdreich	Hopkins
Carper	Evans (IA)	Horton

Howard	Miller (WA)	Shelby
Hoyer	Mineta	Shumway
Hubbard	Mitchell	Shuster
Huckaby	Moakley	Sikorski
Hughes	Molinar	Siljander
Hunter	Mollohan	Sisisky
Hutto	Monson	Skeen
Hyde	Montgomery	Skelton
Ireland	Moody	Slattery
Jacobs	Moore	Slaughter
Jeffords	Moorhead	Smith (FL)
Johnson	Morrison (CT)	Smith (IA)
Jones (OK)	Morrison (WA)	Smith (NE)
Jones (TN)	Mrazek	Smith (NH)
Kanjorski	Murphy	Smith (NJ)
Kaptur	Murtha	Smith, Denny
Kasich	Myers	Smith, Robert
Kastenmeier	Natcher	Snowe
Kennelly	Neal	Snyder
Kildee	Nelson	Solarz
Kindness	Nichols	Solomon
Klecza	Nielson	Spence
Kolbe	Nowak	Spratt
Kolter	O'Brien	St Germain
Kostmayer	Oakar	Stallings
Kramer	Oberstar	Stangeland
LaFalce	Obey	Stark
Lagomarsino	Olin	Stenholm
Lantos	Ortiz	Stokes
Latta	Owens	Strang
Leach (IA)	Oxley	Stratton
Leath (TX)	Packard	Studds
Lehman (CA)	Panetta	Stump
Lehman (FL)	Parris	Sundquist
Leland	Pashayan	Sweeney
Lent	Pease	Swift
Levin (MI)	Penny	Swindall
Levine (CA)	Pepper	Synar
Lewis (CA)	Perkins	Tallon
Lewis (FL)	Petri	Tauke
Lightfoot	Porter	Tauzin
Lipinski	Price	Thomas (CA)
Livingston	Pursell	Thomas (GA)
Lloyd	Quillen	Torres
Loeffler	Rahall	Towns
Long	Rangel	Traficant
Lott	Ray	Traxler
Lowery (CA)	Regula	Udall
Lowry (WA)	Reid	Valentine
Lujan	Richardson	Vander Jagt
Lundine	Ridge	Vento
Lungren	Rinaldo	Visclosky
Mack	Ritter	Volkmer
MacKay	Roberts	Vucanovich
Madigan	Robinson	Walgren
Manton	Rodino	Walker
Markey	Roe	Watkins
Marlenee	Roemer	Waxman
Martin (IL)	Rogers	Weber
Martin (NY)	Rose	Weiss
Martinez	Rostenkowski	Wheat
Matsui	Roth	Whitehurst
Mavroules	Roukema	Whitley
Mazzoli	Rowland (CT)	Whittaker
McCain	Rowland (GA)	Whitten
McCandless	Roybal	Williams
McCloskey	Rudd	Wirth
McCollum	Russo	Wise
McCurdy	Sabo	Wolf
McDade	Savage	Wolpe
McGrath	Saxton	Wortley
McHugh	Schaefer	Wright
McKernan	Schneider	Wyden
McKinney	Schroeder	Wylie
McMillan	Schuetz	Yates
Meyers	Schulze	Yatron
Mica	Schumer	Young (AK)
Michel	Seiberling	Young (FL)
Mikulski	Sensenbrenner	Young (MO)
Miller (CA)	Sharp	Zschau
Miller (OH)	Shaw	

□ 1750

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Four hundred and ten Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand of the

gentleman from California [Mr. ZSCHAU] for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair announces that 5 minutes will be allowed for this vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 226, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 152]

AYES—190

Andrews	Hall, Ralph	Olin
Applegate	Hamilton	Oxley
Archer	Hammerschmidt	Packard
Army	Hansen	Panetta
Badham	Hartnett	Pashayan
Barnard	Heftel	Pease
Bartlett	Henry	Penny
Barton	Hiler	Petri
Bates	Hillis	Porter
Bennett	Hopkins	Pursell
Bevill	Hubbard	Ray
Billakis	Huckaby	Ridge
Boehlert	Hughes	Rittler
Boner (TN)	Hutto	Roberts
Boulter	Hyde	Robinson
Breaux	Ireland	Roemer
Broomfield	Jacobs	Rogers
Brown (CO)	Jeffords	Roth
Broyhill	Jenkins	Rowland (CT)
Burton (IN)	Jones (OK)	Rowland (GA)
Byron	Kanjorski	Russo
Callahan	Kasich	Saxton
Campbell	Kastenmeier	Schaefer
Carney	Kindness	Schroeder
Carper	Kolbe	Sensenbrenner
Chandler	Kramer	Sharp
Chappie	LaFalce	Shumway
Cheney	Lagomarsino	Shuster
Coats	Latta	Skeen
Coble	Leach (IA)	Skelton
Combest	Lewis (FL)	Slattery
Cooper	Lightfoot	Slaughter
Craig	Livingston	Smith (NH)
Crane	Lloyd	Smith, Denny
Daniel	Loeffler	Smith, Robert
Dannemeyer	Lott	Snowe
Darden	Lujan	Snyder
Daub	Lundine	Solomon
DeLay	Lungren	Spence
Derrick	Mack	Spratt
DeWine	MacKay	Stallings
Donnelly	Madigan	Stenholm
Dornan (CA)	Martin (IL)	Strang
Dreier	McCaIn	Stump
Dyson	McCandless	Sundquist
Eckert (NY)	McCollum	Sweeney
Emerson	McCurdy	Swindall
English	McKernan	Tallon
Erdreich	McMillan	Tauke
Fawell	Meyers	Tauzin
Flelds	Mica	Thomas (CA)
Flippo	Miller (OH)	Thomas (GA)
Fowler	Miller (WA)	Valentine
Franklin	Monson	Vander Jagt
Frenzel	Montgomery	Vucanovich
Gekas	Moore	Walker
Gibbons	Moorhead	Whitley
Gingrich	Morrison (WA)	Whittaker
Goodling	Myers	Wirth
Gradison	Neal	Wyllie
Gregg	Nelson	Young (FL)
Grotberg	Nichols	Zschau
Gunderson	Nielson	
Hall (OH)	Nowak	

NOES—226

Ackerman	Berman	Bustamante
Addabbo	Biaggi	Carr
Alexander	Billiey	Chappell
Anderson	Boggs	Clay
Annunzio	Boland	Cobey
Anthony	Bonior (MI)	Coleman (TX)
Aspin	Bonker	Collins
Atkins	Borski	Conte
AuCoin	Bosco	Conyers
Barnes	Boucher	Coughlin
Bateman	Boxer	Courter
Bedell	Brooks	Coyne
Bellenson	Bruce	Crockett
Bentley	Bryant	Daschle
Bereuter	Burton (CA)	Davis

de la Garza	Kolter	Roe
Dickinson	Kostmayer	Rose
Dicks	Lantos	Rostenkowski
Dingell	Leath (TX)	Roukema
DioGuardi	Lehman (CA)	Roybal
Dixon	Lehman (FL)	Rudd
Dorgan (ND)	Leland	Sabo
Dowdy	Lent	Savage
Duncan	Levin (MI)	Scheuer
Durbin	Levine (CA)	Schneider
Dwyer	Lewis (CA)	Schuetz
Dymally	Lipinski	Schulze
Early	Long	Schumer
Eckart (OH)	Lowery (CA)	Seiberling
Edgar	Lowry (WA)	Shaw
Edwards (CA)	Lukens	Shelby
Edwards (OK)	Manton	Sikorski
Evans (IA)	Markey	Siljander
Evans (IL)	Marlenee	Siskis
Fascell	Martin (NY)	Smith (FL)
Fazio	Martinez	Smith (IA)
Feighan	Matsui	Smith (NE)
Felder	Mavroules	Smith (NJ)
Fish	Mazzoli	Solarz
Florio	McCloskey	St Germain
Foglietta	McDade	Stangeland
Foley	McGrath	Stark
Ford (MI)	McHugh	Stokes
Ford (TN)	McKinney	Stratton
Frank	Michel	Studds
Frost	Mikulski	Swift
Fuqua	Miller (CA)	Synar
Gallo	Mineta	Torres
Garcia	Mitchell	Towns
Gaydos	Moakley	Trafficant
Gejdenson	Mollinari	Traxler
Gephardt	Mollohan	Udall
Gilman	Moody	Vento
Glickman	Morrison (CT)	Vislosky
Gonzalez	Mrazek	Volkmer
Gordon	Murphy	Walgren
Gray (IL)	Murtha	Watkins
Gray (PA)	Natcher	Waxman
Green	O'Brien	Weber
Guarini	Oaker	Weiss
Hatcher	Oberstar	Wheat
Hayes	Obey	Whitehurst
Hefner	Ortiz	Whitten
Hendon	Owens	Williams
Hertel	Parris	Wise
Holt	Pepper	Wolf
Horton	Perkins	Wolpe
Howard	Price	Wortley
Hoyer	Quillen	Wright
Hunter	Rahall	Wyden
Johnson	Rangel	Yates
Jones (TN)	Regula	Yatron
Kaptur	Reid	Young (AK)
Kennelly	Richardson	Young (MO)
Kildee	Rinaldo	
Klecza	Rodino	

NOT VOTING—17

Akaka	Downey	Staggers
Brown (CA)	Hawkins	Taylor
Clinger	Jones (NC)	Torricelli
Coelho	Kemp	Weaver
Coleman (MO)	McEwen	Wilson
Dellums	Pickle	

□ 1800

Mr. HUNTER changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

● Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 1985 supplemental appropriations bill turns back a dangerous trend begun in the fiscal year 1982 budget. This bill recognizes the mistakes made in that budget that severely cut back on the number of U.S. Customs personnel, particularly Customs inspectors.

The bill provides for 120 additional Customs inspectors and import specialists to be added in the current fiscal year. It also provides for full funding of the January 1985 pay in-

crease for Customs Service personnel. The full funding of that pay increase will allow the Customs Service to hire the full number of personnel funded by Congress in the regular Treasury appropriations bill for fiscal year 1985. If we had not passed that provision, the Customs Service estimates it would be understaffed by some 525 positions. Additionally, the bill includes language calling for Customs to lift the hiring freeze imposed by the Commissioner of Customs last December in order that those 525 personnel and the 120 additional personnel may be hired immediately.

Mr. Chairman, the cutbacks in Customs personnel since fiscal year 1982 have not produced efficiency and economy. On the contrary, those draconian reductions have brought chaos and confusion to the Customs Service. Working conditions have deteriorated. Commerce and tourism have been delayed, a particularly bad situation for the United States-Mexico border economy which has been trying to stage a comeback from the 1981-82 Mexican peso devaluations. And, in one case, the cutbacks have resulted in the death of a Customs inspector. I believe this policy of reducing personnel to create economy and efficiency has been a failure. When one considers the fact that the Customs Service is one of the few agencies of the Federal Government that actually contributes more funds to the Treasury than it takes out—\$20 taken in for each \$1 appropriated—I believe that the previous cuts, and future proposals are clearly unjustified.

A major factor to consider is the issue of widespread drug abuse in this Nation. We in Congress continue to stand up and denounce drug abuse and drugs smuggling, but there comes a time when we must act. Under the present conditions, as the front line of defense against narcotics entering our country, the Customs Service only inspect 2 percent of all containers entering our country. If we are really serious about attacking the problem of the flow of illegal drugs we must provide the Customs Service with the means to catch smugglers, and that entails more personnel to conduct more surveillance of our borders.

I believe the passage of this bill will signify to the administration and the public that the Congress is willing to take action to stem the flow of illegal drugs into our country. It will show the border areas that we are willing to address the issue of the border economy and improve the flow of cross-border commerce so important to our economy. I look forward to working on the fiscal year 1986 Treasury Appropriations bill to see that we move forward and provide the Customs Service with the funding it needs to do a competent job, minus the chaos and confu-

sion which now exists. If we are to make a real attempt to help international commerce and stem the flow of drugs, we must start by providing the Customs Service with the tools it needs to do the job. This bill is a start in that direction.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to point out that I strongly support the section in chapter VIII of the bill, which provides that the fiscal year 1985 funds for the Emergency Immigrant Education Act be carried over to the next fiscal year should a delay in the obligation of the funds occur.

In fiscal year 1984, not all of the funds were obligated by the Department of Education because many school districts had difficulty in expending the funds. Furthermore, the Department of Education did not provide regulations for the allocation of the funds until late in the fiscal year. The language contained in the bill would address that problem and restate the intent of Congress that the Federal Government will share the financial burden with the local school districts adversely affected by the influx of schoolchildren of immigrant workers, including those of undocumented workers. This is only fair because the Supreme Court ruled that the States are responsible for the education of such children. While I cannot disagree with that ruling, the Congress believed that the Federal Government should share part of that burden since the control of our international borders is a responsibility of the Federal Government. I appreciate the continued support of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Service, and Education for the program.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. In key sections, it addresses the needs of the United States-Mexico border region, which, for so long, has only received passing thought from Washington, DC.

● Mr. HERTEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman my colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. STUDDS, is offering an amendment today that would secure funding for Coast Guard facilities nationwide. I strongly support this gesture and urge my colleagues to lend their support to this important measure.

The Studds amendment would make available \$15 million in funds from the boat safety account of the aquatic resources trust fund. This money would be used for Coast Guard operations, including maintaining the statutory floor of 39,150 persons, maintaining 13 critical search and rescue installations around the Great Lakes, and maintaining 100 temporary duty personnel in drug enforcement activity off the southeast coast.

The aquatic resources trust fund was established by the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984 and consists of money de-

rived from that portion of the Federal tax on gasoline that is attributable to the purchase of motorboat fuel. The amendment will not increase overall Federal expenditures; instead, it will simply ensure that the \$15 million intended by the Deficit Reduction Act to be made available to the Coast Guard will, in fact, go to this service, and not be diverted to other purposes.

The administration's request to consolidate Coast Guard facilities in the Great Lakes basin would have a devastating impact on the citizens of Michigan and other Great Lakes States. In my district alone the administration's proposal to close the only two Coast Guard stations serving Lake Saint Clair would jeopardize the safety and welfare of boaters and lakefront community residents who rely on the Coast Guard for many types of assistance.

Without the proximity of the Coast Guard facilities on Lake Saint Clair, the environmental welfare of our area would also be endangered. Currently, the Coast Guard monitors clean up efforts of environmental accidents, assuring the welfare of marine life and preventing further water pollution, discolored beaches and shoreline damage. The citizens who enjoy the Great Lakes, particularly Lake Saint Clair, know that we have worked hard over the past decade to improve the environmental quality of our water—and we want to maintain this healthy level.

Over the past several months the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee on the Coast Guard has held hearings on the fiscal year 1986 budget request for the Coast Guard. These hearings have demonstrated time and time again the active, diverse and critical role of the Coast Guard nationwide.

Last month I conducted a field hearing in Detroit to review the funding request for the Coast Guard. This enabled representatives from the Great Lakes region to testify on conditions in the Great Lakes and the vital role the Coast Guard plays in our area. After reviewing testimony and carefully studying the issue, I am convinced that cutting or reducing U.S. Coast Guard facilities would greatly endanger the safety and welfare of our citizens.

I urge each of my colleagues to carefully consider this proposal and vote for the Studds amendment.

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I want to rise and express my special support for the provision in H.R. 2577, providing supplemental funds for fiscal year 1985, addressing the funding shortfall in the WIC Program.

Under this legislation, we are providing \$245.6 million—appropriated through the fiscal year 1985 appropriations bill—to implement the full \$1.5 billion provided for this program

in this year. As a result of the backdoor savings initiatives of the Office of Management and Budget—this action is necessary to release the \$245.6 million and assure that pregnant women, infants, and children receive the full amount of funding provided through this program by Congress in this year. Without it—we would be agreeing to a process of allowing OMB to provide 10 months of funding for a program which has been fully funded for a 12-month cycle.

In some States, the activities in this area have resulted in reduced caseloads and waiting lists of up to 3 months. This problem is especially acute in my own city of New York. Take for example, Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center—which has been required to keep its caseload at 1,500 women and infants—despite the fact that this same center delivers almost 4,000 babies per year. It is the high-risk obstetrics center for New York City. More importantly—this same center is able to save \$3 in neonatal costs for every \$1 spent on nutrition supplements.

Mr. Chairman, as a senior member of the House Education and Labor Committee—which has oversight responsibility for this program—I believe that we must act decisively today if we are to assure that the intent of Congress is carried out and the full \$1.5 billion provided by Congress for WIC in this fiscal year is spent. Failure to provide this kind of support for the most vulnerable segments of our citizenry—through a program that has a proven record of support—is shortsighted in its goals and simplistic in its fiscal intent.

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I want to rise to express my strong support for the \$6 million that is provided in this legislation to start the Family Violence Prevention and Treatment Program.

As one of the authors of this legislation—I believe that in providing this modest level of support—we will begin to address some of the most pressing domestic problems which confront us as a society.

The sad but startling statistic point out the facts in this matter and demonstrate the need for these funds: Nearly 6 million women will be abused in any one year; some 2,000 to 4,000 women are beaten to death annually; and battery is the single major cause of injury to women—more significant than auto accidents, rapes, or muggings; and nearly one-half million elderly are abused by their families in any year.

The Family Violence Prevention and Treatment Act is designed to provide modest, startup and operational funds to local, community-based agencies in order to continue or to initiate programs to assist victims of domestic vio-

lence. My own special interest in this area includes assuring that these programs also take into account the special problems faced by abused elderly family members.

As a result of my own efforts as a member of the select Committee on Aging, we have raised the issue of elder abuse—as a family violence problem that must be considered in tandem with spousal abuse. Since 1979, our committee, including my own Subcommittee on Human Services, has conducted a number of hearings on this issue. We were also in the forefront of efforts last year, during the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act, to provide area agencies on aging the opportunity to operate elder abuse programs, as one of the supportive services provided under title III of the act. With the \$6 million in funds provided in this legislation, community-based organizations that receive funds will be encouraged to operate cooperative efforts with area agencies on aging that establish special elder abuse programs.

While we recognize that the problems of elder abuse are special—and that services for elderly victims of family abuse need special kinds of services that an abused wife with children require—these funds are the first step in assuring that the services are in fact available at the community level to all victims of all ages.

Accordingly, in addition to the special emphasis on elder abuse in this program, I also was responsible for the antidiscrimination provisions that were added to the report to assure that the elderly receive their fair share of services and are not denied access to programs.

I am especially pleased that of the \$6 million provided in this program, an amount not in excess of \$2 million will be allocated to the Attorney General in order to establish training programs that assist law enforcement personnel in addressing this problem in communities. The fact is police officers spend one-third of their time responding to domestic violence calls. Training and technical assistance is critical if they are to be able to provide the kind of support that is needed.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend that distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. NATCHER, and the ranking Republican, Mr. CONTE, for their foresight and their efforts in providing these long-overdue dollars. Those of us who have been involved in this effort for some years, are gratified by their recognition of the importance of this program and the people it is intended to serve.●

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1985".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments?

If not, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, Pursuant to the rule and to clause 2(d) of rule XXI, I offer the preferential motion that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments and with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The preferential motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the Committee, however, does not rise.

At this point, no further amendments to the bill are in order except the four designated amendments made in order by the rule relating to Nicaragua.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. TRAFICANT] having assumed the chair, Mr. SHARP, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2577) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 142, ANNE FRANK DAY

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 142) to designate June 12, 1985, as "Anne Frank Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise the gentleman that this Senate joint resolution has not yet been messaged to the House by the other body, to the best of the Chairman's knowledge, unless there is some further clarification from the gentleman.

Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA] have a second request?

RECOGNIZING PAUSE FOR PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AS PART OF NATIONAL FLAG DAY ACTIVITIES

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 211) to recognize the pause for the Pledge of Allegiance as part of National Flag Day activities, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to this legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] the chief sponsor of this House joint resolution.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York for bringing this legislation up. The President of the United States will be visiting Fort McHenry and it will be a great honor to have this bill signed.

Mr. Speaker, this Friday, June 14, is Flag Day. National Flag Day was officially designated by the Congress back in 1949. Since then, local Flag Day celebrations have swept across the country. Today the House has passed a resolution which will add a pause for the Pledge of Allegiance as part of these Flag Day celebrations.

It is in my hometown of Baltimore, MD, that the idea for pause for the Pledge originated. The Star-Spangled Banner Flag House, located in Baltimore, has been the official sponsor of Flag Week since 1952. The Flag House was the home of Mary Pickersgill who created the 42 by 30 foot Star-Spangled Banner which flew over Fort McHenry during the War of 1812 and inspired Francis Scott Key to write our national anthem. It is also in Maryland that the National Flag Day Foundation, Inc., was founded. The president of this organization, Mr. Louis Koerber, has worked for many years to conduct educational programs throughout the United States in promotion of National Flag Day and to encourage national patriotism by promoting the pause for the Pledge.

Now, with the passage of this bill, all Americans are urged to pause for a moment on June 14 at 7 p.m. e.d.t. to say simultaneously the 31 words of the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag. The effect of this simple ceremony will be a stimulating experience at home and a sign of unity abroad.

I am proud of the part that the people of Baltimore have played in our country's history. I am also proud that the House has seen fit to make history today by passing this patriotic resolution. In times that are troubled and uncertain, it is necessary to join together in honoring our flag and country and to recommit ourselves to the values which have made our country strong.

□ 1810

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

H.J. RES. 211

Whereas by Act of the Congress of the United States, dated June 14, 1777, the first official flag of the United States was adopted; and

Whereas by Act of Congress, dated August 3, 1949, June 14 of each year was designated "National Flag Day" and the Star-Spangled Banner Flag House Association in Baltimore, Maryland, has been the official sponsor since 1952 of National Flag Day for the United States; and

Whereas on June 14, 1980, the Star-Spangled Banner Flag House Association developed a national campaign to encourage all Americans to pause for the Pledge of Allegiance as part of National Flag Day ceremonies; and

Whereas this concept has caught the imagination of Americans everywhere, and has received wide citizen support and recognition, and there has not been created the National Flag Day Foundation, Incorporated, to plan the Nation's Flag Day ceremonies; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress of the United States recognizes the pause for the Pledge of Allegiance as part of the celebration of National Flag Day throughout the Nation, and urges all Americans to participate on that day by reciting in unison the Pledge of Allegiance to our Nation's Flag, at seven o'clock post meridian eastern daylight time on June 14, 1985.

SEC. 2. The Congress shall transmit a copy of the resolution to the National Flag Day Foundation, Incorporated, in Baltimore, Maryland.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BALTIC FREEDOM DAY

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 66) designating June 14, 1985, as "Baltic Freedom Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object but I simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CARNEY] who is the chief sponsor of the joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 66.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to speak on behalf of Senate Joint Resolution 66, Baltic Freedom Day.

Our consideration of this bill marks this body's continued commitment to the cause of freedom for the people of the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 66 requests the President to issue a proclamation—in conjunction with other appropriate activities—to commemorate this Friday, June 14, as Baltic Freedom Day.

Such a commemoration is important. For it reminds us all that there are still places in the world where people do not live in freedom. The people of the Baltic States lived peacefully and in freedom from 1918 to 1940, when World War II again subjected them to attack by both Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. The Soviets occupy Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania to this day.

Mr. Speaker, the people of these nations have suffered greatly under Soviet rule.

In early June 1941, hundreds of thousands of Baltic people were deported to Siberia. Many perished while still on route in the subhuman travel conditions the Soviets provided. Many others died in labor camps in Siberia, far from their native homelands.

The oppression of the Baltic people continues to this day.

The gulags, prisons, and psychiatric hospitals are filled with people whose only crime is seeking freedom for their nation.

Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 45th anniversary of the United States nonrecognition of the Soviet takeover of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Our country has never recognized the illegal occupation of these countries and always supported the desire of the people of these nations to be free.

This resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 66, allows us in this body to express our solidarity with the cause for freedom for these three nations behind the Iron Curtain. Our colleagues in the other body have already expressed their support in a similar resolution passed in May.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on this important anniversary to join with me in supporting Senate Joint Resolution 66.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution designating June 14 as "Baltic Freedom Day."

The purpose of the resolution is twofold, Mr. Speaker: it demonstrates the solidarity that exists between the people of the United States and the people of the formerly free Baltic States. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, it is tragic: it reminds us—and that is its purpose—that the Baltic States remain under the oppression of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania deserve political, cultural, and religious freedom: rights which have been denied them since their countries were forcibly absorbed into the Soviet Union in the early 1940's. These are people who cherish the principles of liberty and justice and want nothing more than to assert their national identities through independent statehood.

The domination of the Baltic peoples by the Soviet Union is one of the great tragedies of the modern age. Baltic peoples have been forcibly deported from their homelands, which have been repopulated by other ethnic groups in an attempt to suppress the indigenous population and its culture.

The people of the United States care deeply about the political freedom and cultural identities of the Baltic people. Americans have continually supported them ever since their fate became known in the West.

We stand in solidarity with the people of the Baltic States, and hope for the day when they will again see the light of freedom.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER].

Mr. RITTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my support and comments to this Baltic Freedom Day. Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, the people there are brave peoples. They are definitely three different nations which are forced to live under the boot of the Soviet power. They take great interest in the fact that the United States of America has not diplomatically recognized the forcible annexation of these three nations. They take pride in the fact that we in the U.S. House of Representatives call attention to the time during which they were free and independent nations and by us in this House of Representatives, along with Baltic Americans and Baltic peoples throughout the world as well as those in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, as long as we

keep that candle of freedom burning they will keep their hopes alive for one day having independence once again from the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank and commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. CARNEY] for bringing this important issue, the Baltic Freedom Day Resolution, before the House.

The commemoration of June 14, 1985, symbolizes our solidarity with the oppressed citizens of the Baltic States, and condemns the illegal and forced occupation of their soil by the Soviet Union. Moreover, since the signing of the Helsinki accords in 1975, the Soviets continue to constantly and blatantly violate both the letter and spirit of the accord's human rights provisions. In particular, Moscow has refused to allow the free flow of people and ideas across national boundaries, and the right of people within each country to practice "freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief" pursuant to the accords.

It is and always has been, the inherent duty of all democratic governments to insure, through all reasonably feasible channels, that the basic civil liberties, culture, language, traditions, religion and political and territorial independence—in short, the national sovereignty—of any people are perpetuated via their own accord, and not infringed upon, coerced, or destroyed by any foreign power.

On August 14, 1941, Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed the Atlantic Charter of eight points, the second point of which declared that the United States would approve "no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned." The third point declared the signatories respect for the "rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live"; and their "wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

With this Baltic Freedom Day Resolution, we renew our original convictions of 45 years ago, and continue to stand firm in our commitment for the reestablishment of Baltic national sovereignty. ●

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 66

Whereas the people of the Baltic Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have cherished the principles of religious and political freedom and independence;

Whereas the Baltic Republics have existed as independent, sovereign nations belong-

ing to and fully recognized by the League of Nations;

Whereas the people of the Baltic Republics have individual and separate cultures, national traditions, and languages distinctively foreign to those of Russia;

Whereas the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics (U.S.S.R.) in 1940 did illegally seize and occupy the Baltic Republics and by force incorporate them against their national will and contrary to their desire for independence and sovereignty into the U.S.S.R.;

Whereas the U.S.S.R. since 1940 has systematically removed native Baltic peoples from their homelands by deporting them to Siberia and caused great masses of Russians to relocate in the Baltic Republics, thus threatening the Baltic cultures with extinction;

Whereas the U.S.S.R. has imposed upon the captive people of the Baltic Republics an oppressive political system which has destroyed every vestige of democracy, civil liberties, and religious freedom;

Whereas the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania find themselves today subjugated by the U.S.S.R., locked into a union they deplore, denied basic human rights, and persecuted for daring to protest;

Whereas the U.S.S.R. refuses to abide by the Helsinki accords which the U.S.S.R. voluntarily signed;

Whereas the United States stands as a champion of liberty, dedicated to the principles of national self-determination, human rights, and religious freedom, and opposed to oppression and imperialism;

Whereas the United States, as a member of the United Nations, has repeatedly voted with a majority of that international body to uphold the right of other countries of the world, including those in Africa and Asia, to determine their fates and be free of foreign domination;

Whereas the U.S.S.R. has steadfastly refused to return to the people of the Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, the right to exist as independent republics separate and apart from the U.S.S.R. or permit a return of personal, political, and religious freedoms, and

Whereas the U.S.S.R. conscripts Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians into the Soviet Armed Forces compelling them to serve in Afghanistan, Vietnam, and Cuba: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress of the United States recognizes the continuing desire and the right of the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia for freedom and independence from the domination of the U.S.S.R. and deplores the refusal of the U.S.S.R. to recognize the sovereignty of the Baltic Republics and to yield to their rightful demands for independence from foreign domination and oppression and that the fourteenth day of June 1985, the anniversary of the mass deportation of Baltic peoples from their homelands in 1941, be designated "Baltic Freedom Day" as a symbol of the solidarity of the American people with the aspirations of the enslaved Baltic people and that the president of the United States be authorized and requested to issue a proclamation for the observance of Baltic Freedom Day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a

motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolutions just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include therein extraneous material on the subject of the 1-minute speech today by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE FARM CRISIS

(Mr. DASCHLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, in recent months I have been asked time and again by many of our colleagues about whether the farm crisis has actually blown over.

The fact is that the farm crisis in the last couple of months has actually gotten worse. The recent reports that they received 90 percent of the financing they needed only means that 90 to 95 percent of those farmers have gotten deeper in debt and they are deeper in debt to a degree which we have never seen in history. The aggregate farm indebtedness next year will be more than \$230 billion, and of that \$230 billion more than \$60 billion will be held by those who have a debt to asset ratio of 70 percent or greater.

As a matter of fact, 2-year land values are now projected to decline by more than 40 percent by the end of this year. Just last week four banks in Nebraska closed their doors.

The situation is getting worse. The farmers' projected income next year is going to be less and the situation deserves and demands our attention.

Recently an article was written in the Wall Street Journal depicting the current situation in agriculture. It is an accurate reflection of the seriousness of the situation. It is an accurate depiction of how grave the problems really are and I urge my colleagues to read it.

I include the article at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 6, 1985]

BANKS GIVE FARMERS LOANS AND PRAY FOR BAILOUT

LENDERS ARE SQUEEZED AS AGRICULTURE ECONOMY DETERIORATES

(By Charles F. McCoy, and Marj Charlier)

Gary Larson, a Council Bluffs, Iowa, farmer with his back to the wall, got a \$50,000 planting loan this spring.

It didn't seem to matter much that he still owed the bank \$40,000 from last year, that he had negative cash flow and that the value of his collateral had been rapidly disappearing. Nor did it matter that both he and his banker agreed as they closed the loan that there was virtually no way Mr. Larson would be able to repay.

"He shrugged, I shrugged, he signed me on," Mr. Larson recalls. "We knew it'd take some kind of drastic changes for either of us to come out all right. I mean miracles."

But miracles are in short supply these days. The battered farm economy has deteriorated in recent weeks, shoving farm lenders and their customers deeper into the morass. Land values, the collateral holding up most agriculture loans, are unraveling faster than at anytime since the farm upheaval began four years ago; many observers predict land values will drift downward for years before touching bottom at as little as a quarter of peak prices of the early 1980s. Depressed commodity prices and exports are expected to plunge further this fall.

Even the weather won't cooperate: The Soviet Union has had a lovely spring, unmarred by the drought that wrecked crops there last year and opened the Soviet market to big shipments of American grain.

"Every fundamental trend is going downhill steadily," says Sung Won Sohn, chief economist at Norwest Corp., a big bank holding company based in Minneapolis. "We're looking at poor conditions this year, probably worse next year, persisting through 1987 and perhaps beyond."

PROBLEM LOANS INCREASE

That bleak litany is turning up the heat on farm lenders. The number of farm banks with more problem loans than capital—a leading indicator of failure—was at 89 and rising as of Dec. 31, up one-third from 64 last June, according to Veribanc Inc., a consulting firm in Woburn, Mass. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corp.'s problem bank list now includes 371 farm banks; last June, the figure was 231. Twenty-four of the 43 banks that have failed so far this year were agricultural banks.

Many banks, afraid to take heavy write-offs in their weakened conditions, continue to defer losses by lending more to essentially broke farmers on the thin hope that something will surface to make them whole. About 95% of farmers got planting loans this spring, belying predictions that only 85% to 90% would get new money. Much of that credit came from government agencies such as the Farmers Home Administration, but bankers and regulators concede that banks threw millions of dollars of good money after bad.

"We know a lot more farmers than that 5% who got cut out (who) are in terrible shape," says Elden Rance, president of First National Bank of Worthington, Minn. "For a lot of farmers and banks, the agony has merely been prolonged."

RED-TAPE NIGHTMARE

Richard Chesley could fit that category. A Missouri wheat farmer, he is behind on pay-

ments to the FmHA on some 300 acres, has negative cash flow and has a debt-to-asset ratio of about 120%. Yet his bank lent him planting money. "The bank is hanging with me," he says. "Get some better prices, I may be able to pay back."

Some bankers still hold out hope that the government will help turn things around, but no action is expected soon. The administration's major stab at farm relief, a \$650 million emergency loan program launched this spring, is puny in comparison to the \$212 billion farmers owe banks and federal agencies. And it has been a red-tape nightmare. "It took a hundred filled-out forms and 2½ months, and by then it was damn near too late," says Ray Jenkins, a beet farmer near Greeley, Colo.

Bankers carp that too many farmers were left out because the government's cash-flow requirements are too tough. And only \$31.7 million has been lent under the part of the program the administration touted most, an offer to guarantee most of a loan if the bankers would knock off 10% of the principal or interest. For their part, federal officials complain that some bankers are abusing the program by trying to dump hopelessly indebted farmers on the government, rather than the temporarily pinched operators the program is designed to cover.

"This program and all the other stuff the government is talking about are stopgap measures, but they're not enough to stop up all the gaps we've got now," says Weldon Barton, agricultural representative of the Independent Bankers Association of America.

Farm banks—so-called because at least a quarter of their loans are to farmers—and other commercial banks with agriculture portfolios together have about \$51 billion in farm exposure. As much as 50% of that debt, or \$25.5 billion, is now "dangerously delinquent or soon to be," estimates W.H. Shirley, a farm bank consultant in Merriam, Kan. About 13.5% of BankAmerica Corp.'s Bank of America unit's \$1.7 billion of farm loans was at least 90 days past due as of March 31, compared with 10.5% at year-end; one Bank of America official concedes that, barring some unlikely about-face in the farm economy, the banking giant's agricultural loan write-offs this year could match 1984's \$77 million.

PROMISE OF MORE FAILURES

For smaller farm lenders, the deteriorating outlook has meant a slew of failures and the promise of many more. In Iowa, where the farm crisis is hitting hardest, banks in Odebolt, Story City and Massena closed within a two-week period beginning in late April. Some bankers predict that as many as 20 Iowa banks will fail this year. In 1984, three failed.

In Iowa and other farm states, officials worry that the farm turmoil is scaring off investors and bleeding the banks of capital to the point that economic development will be set back years. Already promoters of a planned horse race track near Des Moines that the state is counting on for badly needed tax revenues have run into trouble finding backers. "Investors are worried about our banks and farmers having any money left to spend," says Dean Rowland, Iowa's chief bank examiner.

Farm bankers contend they're coming to grips with the snowballing problems. But in many instances, banks can't write off loans fast enough to heal themselves. First State Bank in Paullina, Iowa, has taken the kind of tough measures cheered by regulators, writing off a fifth of its \$15 million in loans

over the past eight months. But that only cut First State's ratio of problem loans to capital from 229% to about 180%, still deep in the danger zone.

Many bankers have been counting on a recent shift to cash-flow lending from lending against inflated land values to contain their loan losses. But with commodity prices sagging and farm income now projected to fall to \$25 billion from last year's \$33 billion, cash-flow lending "isn't much of an answer, because people you figured would have some cash flow aren't going to," says E. Harry Hess, president of Greeley (Colo.) State Bank.

BANKS ACCUMULATE FARMLAND

The farm banks' land problem also is getting worse. Through farm failures and foreclosures, banks in recent months have been accumulating farmland in many areas faster than at almost anytime since the Depression. In Iowa, for example, banks held \$153 million of farm real estate assets as of March 31, up 33% from \$115 million a year earlier.

That portends big trouble for the banks, because the value of farmland is crashing. The gloomy outlook has kept potential buyers away, fattening an already huge land glut and driving prices down 6% to 9% in the first quarter alone in most parts of the Farm Belt.

At a recent auction near Cedarville, Ill., a dairy farm with a mortgage of about \$880 an acre got one bid of \$550; the bank that was trying to unload it decided not to sell. In Louisa County, Iowa, prime farmland that went for \$2,300 an acre in 1981 is valued at \$1,600 an acre. Thomas Huston, Iowa's banking superintendent, says prices will fall to \$800 an acre before stabilizing. He and other observers think land prices could ultimately approach the lower levels prevalent in foreign countries U.S. farmers compete with. "We're in for a hell of a whipping," Mr. Huston says.

The plunging land prices are sticking banks with assets that are declining in market value almost every week. Still, banks are holding off on dumping the land on the glutted market; there are few buyers, and selling at today's depressed prices would mean major losses and would only depress land values further.

GOOD WILL FORESTALLS LOSSES

Regulatory good will has permitted banks to forestall massive losses on farmland in some areas. In Iowa, the state Legislature last year passed a law allowing banks to hang on to real estate for five years; previously, they had to sell within a year. Federal regulators are easing up as well, permitting banks in Colorado and elsewhere to hold land for as long as 10 years without selling.

But such moves are small comfort, especially as bankers look toward the winter planting season and another round with credit-starved, debt-heavy farmers. Already, some economists are guessing another 5% of farmers won't get loans, forcing banks to swallow more losses and throwing more land onto the market.

And there are worried whispers that the conflict between borrower and lender could turn nastier. Farmer lawsuits against banks are occurring more frequently, and some farmers have even forced lenders to refinance them by threatening to simply walk away from bad debt. "I wouldn't want to be in a banker's shoes for the next few years," says Mr. Larson, the Iowa farmer. "Then

again, I suppose it won't be any better in the farmer's shoes."

ESSEX-MIDDLE RIVER 25TH BIRTHDAY

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, on June 13, 1985, the Essex-Middle River Civic Council, located in the eastern portion of my district in Maryland, will celebrate its 25th birthday.

The council was informed in late 1959 by a movement of the Women's Club of Middle River. Mrs. Anita Lyden of Rosedale formed the council with the motto "We live here—We care." How well this phrase reflects both the area and the people who live and work there.

The articles of early council outlines its goals and purposes: To advance educational, civic, social, commercial, and economic interests, to cultivate social relationships among its members, to discover and correct abuses, to prevent or adjust controversies, to promote integrity and good faith, just and equal principles in business and professional activities, and uniformity in commercial uses, and to conduct a club for the purpose of providing for the refreshment, entertainment, and social diversion of its members.

Today, as a result of the strong presidency of Mrs. Alberta Pugh in the 1970's, the council is stronger, larger and more knowledgeable than ever. It continues to demand respect for the area and serve it well. So to the many hard working and dedicated community and civic minded volunteers of the Essex-Middle River Civic Council, I say happy 25th birthday—and many, many more.

The Essex-Middle River Civic Council was formed in late 1959 by a movement of the members of the Womans Club of Middle River. At the urging of several members of the Womans Club, Mrs. Anita Lyden of Rosedale, wife of Dr. Robert Lyden, formed the council with a motto of "We care—We live here."

The council was composed of delegates and representatives from civic and womans clubs in the area. The initial concern for the council was becoming involved in the issue of spot zoning, which according to Mrs. Lyden could turn a residential area into a business area almost automatically. It seems that we are fighting the same battles 25 years later.

Mrs. Lyden saw the need for a single areawide clearinghouse or council, but she still stressed the need for individual groups for the important role they play in community problems.

Those organizations represented on the council at its start were the

Bauernschmidt Manor Improvement Association, Country Ridge Civic Association, Long Beach Improvement Association, Martindale Civic Association, Middleborough Civic Association, Hope Lutheran Church, Glenmar PTA, Mars Estates PTA, Victory Villa PTA, and Sussex PTA. The first group of officers for the council were, Robert D. Romeril, president; Walter Heinicke, vice president; Dorothy Muse, recording secretary; Joseph Fuchs, treasurer; and Mrs. Harry McCord, corresponding secretary.

The civic council formally incorporated on June 13, 1960, with Robert Paul Mann as the resident agent, and Robinson Walter, Irene Jordan, and Kathy McCord as the directors.

The purposes of the council as listed in the articles of incorporation were to advance the educational, civic, social, commercial, and economic interests of the community of Essex-Middle River; to cultivate social relations among its members; to discover and correct abuses; to prevent or adjust controversies; to promote integrity and good faith, just and equal principles in business and professional activities, and uniformity in commercial uses; and to conduct a club for the purpose of providing for the refreshment, entertainment, and social diversion of its members.

At that time the council began upon a long term of community service that saw many rewards and benefits for the area. Unfortunately however, with each new victory many members of the council were finding no new major issues to become involved in and slowly interest and attendance in the council began to diminish. These were lean and hard years for the council but just as many a great athlete has had a comeback so did the council.

In September 1969 with a great deal of help from Mrs. Maxine Leroy, one of the original founders of the council, the Essex-Middle River Civic Council was reorganized. At this point in time, the council as we know it today had begun. Many hard working and dedicated community and civic minded volunteers joined the council to help provide and promote a more appealing Essex-Middle River community.

The mid-1970's began the newest and most productive era in the council's history. At this time, Mrs. Alberta Pugh was first elected to serve as president of the council. Mrs. Pugh had a working knowledge of zoning laws, the county code, health regulations, et cetera, that was second to none. She used this knowledge to attract greater numbers to join the council, and put these people to work in the proper areas that would be more profitable to the community. Mrs. Pugh was a one woman army who put Essex-Middle on the map, and gained respect for our community from the entire State. Her tireless

dedication and devotion carried the council through the 1970's and into the 1980's. Mrs. Pugh's death in 1983 left a great void in the council as she had been doing the work of 10 people.

The story is not lost there however, not wanting to see the council die again, and out of tribute to Mrs. Pugh, a handful of volunteers such as Rev. Willie Chambers, Randy Cogar, George Frangos, Keith Roberts, and others have banded together to see that the council continues to survive into the next century.

It is with the knowledge of these facts that we can boast that the Essex-Middle River Civic Council, Inc. will continue to serve as the greatest community council in the State of Maryland for infinity.

We wish a very happy 25th birthday to the council, and a longer more successful future.

VANCE, McNAMARA, VICE ADMIRAL LEE OPPOSE NEW NERVE GAS WEAPONS

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues a very important letter which I received from former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, former Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, and Vice Adm. John M. Lee.

These three distinguished public servants view production of new binary nerve gas weapons as not serving our country's national security interests. They stress in this letter that these new binary weapons are unnecessary, unproven, potentially inferior to and a greater logistical problem than our existing unitary chemical weapons, and a political liability with our allies.

They conclude by stating that the technical, operational, and political liabilities of the binary convince them that these new nerve gas weapons should not be funded at this time. I want to remind my colleagues that the cost of these new weapons will be \$174 million this year and at least \$2.3 billion over the next 5 years.

I urge my colleagues to carefully consider the opinions of these national security and defense experts when we vote on the Porter-Fascell amendment to the DOD authorization bill.

Their letter follows:

JUNE 2, 1985.

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL,
Chairman, House Foreign Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FASCELL: As former defense and foreign policy officials, we are writing today to express our concern over the request for the fiscal year 1986 funds of

\$163 million for the production of binary chemical weapons.

At the outset, we wish to emphasize that we would not question binary chemical weapons production if we thought such an action would put the United States at a disadvantage militarily. However, it is our view that U.S. national security interests will be ill-served by producing binary weapons at this time.

First, we believe that our existing stockpiles of chemical munitions make the additional request of binary weapons unnecessary. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger addressed the issue of the adequacy of our current chemical artillery stockpile in a February 1, 1983 written response to questions from Senator Sam Nunn:

"For procurement of new artillery shells, the need is not one of redressing a clear lack of military capability. The U.S. possesses a stockpile of chemical nerve agent artillery shells, similar to the proposed M-687 binary round, that are compatible with modern 155mm. and 8-inch artillery pieces. The quantity is in the range of sufficiency (at least for U.S. forces) and actually is higher than the planned acquisition quantity for the binary projectile."

Second, we believe that the proposed binary chemical munitions may actually be militarily inferior to the unitary weapons in our existing stockpile. Because the binaries have never been open-air tested in their actual configuration, their reliability is far from certain. Test failures involving the proposed Bigeye binary bomb, which led both the House and Senate Armed Services Committees to delete part of the administration's fiscal year 1984 request for this program, underscore the importance of not proceeding with the production of binary munitions until they have been fully tested.

Third, binaries also create greater logistical problems compared to existing chemical weapons because they are heavier and bulkier, and because there are two separate components which must be assembled on the battlefield. An April 29, 1983 General Accounting Office Report to the Congress, entitled "Chemical Warfare: Many Unanswered Questions," considers these factors and concludes:

"The available data do not sustain the argument that binaries offer substantial technical and operational advantages over existing weapons . . . Army estimates indicate that nearly four times the space is required for transporting and storing binary munitions, compared to unitary."

Finally, it is also far from clear whether our friends and allies in Europe would be positively disposed toward the repositioning of binary weapons on their soil. We are concerned that an attempt to deploy binary chemical weapons will not only be rejected by our European allies, but could also trigger a request for the removal of currently deployed unitary chemical weapons from West Germany.

The foregoing points certainly suggest that spending billions of dollars on the procurement of binary munitions does not constitute a judicious allocation of our defense dollars. In our opinion, the technical, operational and political uncertainties surrounding the proposed binary chemical weapons program thus argue strongly against funding binary weapons production at the present time.

We urge you to support the upcoming effort to delete the \$163 million binary pro-

duction request from the fiscal year 1986 defense authorization bill.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.
CYRUS VANCE.
Vice Admiral JOHN M. LEE.

EX-CONTRA WARNS OF U.S. INVASION

(Mr. ALEXANDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, this morning I joined other Members of Congress at breakfast with Edgar Chamorro, whose family has produced four former Presidents of Nicaragua. Mr. Chamorro described his support for the ouster of Somoza, later becoming a member of the dictatorship of the Contras [FDN] after Marxists gained control of the Sandinista [FSLN] government.

Mr. Chamorro observes that the 4-year U.S. policy of pain toward Nicaragua has failed:

That in his country where 60 percent of the population is under 20 years of age, the pain is suffered most by helpless children.

That Mr. Reagan's policy supports an army run by Sandinistas who terrorize, kidnap, rape, and murder in the name of freedom.

That U.S. policy encourages the radical elements to unite against the Contra front for the CIA which is perceived to be the vanguard for a U.S. military invasion.

That in his words, the United States is forcing Nicaragua like Cuba 25 years ago, to become more dependent upon the Soviet Union.

And that democracy can work only if the United States will permit Contadora to work.

I submit for the RECORD a copy of a letter from Mr. Chamorro, together with my letter of transmittal to Members of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 10, 1985.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Until late last year, Edgar Chamorro served as one of the principal leaders of the Nicaraguan rebels. He subsequently broke with the contra movement, and is now free to give his own personal assessment of the contra army, and the possible effects of new American aid in Nicaragua.

Mr. Chamorro is probably one of the best sources of first-hand information about the contra movement. Last week I asked him to prepare a letter to Members of Congress, summarizing his views on the possibility of renewed American assistance to the contras. That letter is attached. I urge you to take a few moments to reflect on its contents before the House considers the Nicaragua issue on Wednesday.

With kindest regards, I am
Sincerely,

BILL ALEXANDER.

JUNE 10, 1985.

ESTEEMED MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: My name is Edgar Chamorro Coronel. I am a Nicaragua citizen and a former member of the National Directorate of the Nicaraguan Democratic Force (FDN)—currently the largest rebel force opposing the Sandinista government. I take this opportunity to write to you, distinguished members of the United States Congress, out of my concern for the future of my homeland, as well as the direction of U.S. policy in the region.

Prior to the Nicaraguan revolution in 1979, I lived and worked in Nicaragua. I was educated and trained by the Jesuit order of the Catholic Church and spent twenty years as a Jesuit. I also served as Dean of the School of Humanities at the University of Central America in Managua and as a member of the Nicaraguan mission to the United Nations.

In 1978 I joined the broad coalition of political parties and organizations which contributed to the overthrow of the Somoza regime. I considered the defeat of Somoza to be a political victory by this broad coalition of forces, not simply a military victory by the Sandinistas. Shortly after the Sandinistas came to power, I became concerned that moderate elements were giving way to the more radical trends within the FSLN. Fearing the radicalization of the revolution, I decided to leave Nicaragua with my wife and two children.

I joined the FDN in an attempt to work for democracy in Nicaragua. For two years I worked out of Tegucigalpa, Honduras as the FDN spokesman in charge of communications. I was intimately involved in and acutely aware of the inner workings of the organization.

I regret to tell you, Members of Congress, that from my personal experience in a leadership role with the FDN I learned that this organization could not contribute to the democratization of Nicaragua. The FDN is in the hands of the ex-National Guard who control the Contra army, stifle internal dissent, and intimidate or murder those who dare to oppose them. This is not a democratic organization. In addition, the FDN has been subject to excessive manipulation by the Central Intelligence Agency which has reduced it to a front organization.

At this moment a critical point has arrived that will effect many Nicaraguans and future relations between Nicaragua and the United States. I would respectfully suggest the importance of deep reflection on the significance of the choice you are now facing.

My most important message to you, stemming from my personal experience with the FDN, is:

A political solution should be the first priority in solving the Nicaraguan conflict. This policy requires opening avenues of dialogue and avoiding confrontation. Past proposals for dialogue have been delivered as ultimatums and are therefore unacceptable. The first step towards national reconciliation and dialogue is the abolition of the contra army.

A policy of national reconciliation would strengthen the moderates and pragmatists and weaken the extremists and ideologues on both sides. Moderate political leadership should not be encouraged to leave the country and join the "freedom fighters." It is these moderates who are most capable of engaging in dialogue.

The present policy of applying military pressure inflicts suffering and pain on the people of Nicaragua, leads to further political polarization, and increases the danger of

military escalation. This policy of applying pressure to the Sandinistas until they "cry uncle" grossly underestimates the extent of Nicaraguan pride and self-esteem. A revolution based on national pride and dignity will never "cry uncle."

The Contadora initiative presents the best available option for achieving a lasting political solution in Nicaragua. Nicaragua is a Latin American problem best solved by Latin politicians. American interests in Nicaragua are best defended by genuine support for the Contadora process.

I consider humanitarian assistance to the contras just another vehicle for the prolongation of this war. The only assistance worthy of the name "humanitarian aid" is assistance to the victims of the conflict on both sides.

Let me leave you with a final thought. Finding a solution to the conflict in Nicaragua requires patience in spite of the apparent urgency; wisdom in the midst of complexity; tolerance and magnanimity to accept the stumbling steps of a young nation finding its own way. Such qualities are the privilege of a great power and the most important contribution that the United States can make toward solving the crisis in Nicaragua.

Sincerely,

EDGAR CHAMORRO CORONEL.

PRESIDENT SUPPORTS BIPARTISAN PROPOSAL TO ASSIST FORCES OF DEMOCRACY IN NICARAGUA

(Mr. McCURDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCURDY. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a letter I received from President Reagan today, and I would like to highlight a couple points that the President made when he addressed this letter to me. He said:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McCURDY: I am writing to express my strongest support for your bipartisan proposal to assist the forces of democracy in Nicaragua. . . .

He said:

My Administration is determined to pursue political, not military, solutions in Central America. Our policy for Nicaragua is the same as for El Salvador and all of Central America: to support the democratic center against the extremes of both the right and left, and to secure democracy and lasting peace through national dialogue and regional negotiations. We do not seek the military overthrow of the Sandinista government or to put in its place a government based on supports of the old Somoza regime. . . .

We oppose a sharing of political power based on military force rather than the will of the people expressed through free and fair elections. . . . It is also the position of the Nicaraguan opposition leaders, who have agreed that executive authority in Nicaragua should change only through elections. . . .

President Reagan also indicates he takes seriously my concern about human rights. He says:

The U.S. condemns, in the strongest possible terms, atrocities by either side. We are

committed to helping the democratic resistance in applying strict rules regarding proper treatment of prisoners and the civilian population. . . .

Mr. Speaker, the text of the President's letter is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, DC.

Hon. DAVE McCURDY,

House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McCURDY: I am writing to express my strongest support for your bipartisan proposal to assist the force of democracy in Nicaragua. It is essential to a peaceful resolution of the conflict in Central America that the House of Representatives pass that proposal, without any weakening amendments.

My administration is determined to pursue political, not military, solutions in Central America. Our policy for Nicaragua is the same as for El Salvador and all of Central America: to support the democratic center against the extremes of both the right and left, and to secure democracy and lasting peace through national dialogue and regional negotiations. We do not seek the military overthrow of the Sandinista government or to put in its place a government based on supporters of the old Somoza regime.

Just as we support President Duarte in his efforts to achieve reconciliation in El Salvador, we also endorse the unified democratic opposition's March 1, 1985 San Jose Declaration which calls for national reconciliation through a church-mediated dialog. We oppose a sharing of political power based on military force rather than the will of the people expressed through free and fair elections. That is the position of President Duarte. It is also the position of the Nicaraguan opposition leaders, who have agreed that executive authority in Nicaragua should change only through elections.

It is the guerrillas in El Salvador—and their mentors in Managua, Havana, and Moscow—who demand power sharing without elections. And it is the Sandinistas in Nicaragua who stridently reject national reconciliation through democratic processes. Our assistance has been crucial to ensuring that democracy has both the strength and will to work in El Salvador. In Nicaragua, our support is also needed to enable the forces of democracy to convince the Sandinistas that real democratic change is necessary. Without the pressure of a viable and democratic resistance, the Sandinistas will continue to impose their will through repression and military force, and a regional settlement based on the Contadora principles will continue to elude us.

I understand that two "perfecting" amendments will be offered that will seek to nullify the intent of your proposal. One, supported by Ed Boland, would prohibit the exchange of information with the democratic resistance and permanently deny even humanitarian assistance because it would "have the effect" of supporting "directly or indirectly" the military efforts of the resistance. The other, supported by Dick Gephardt, would prohibit humanitarian assistance for at least 6 months and then continue the prohibition until Congress votes yet again.

The Boland amendment is clearly intended to have the same effect as the Barnes amendment that was rejected by the House in April. If the Boland prohibitions are enacted, the only way humanitarian assistance could be provided would be for the recipients to abandon their struggle and become

refugees. The Gephardt proposal, guaranteeing the Sandinistas six additional months without effective pressure, would send a signal of irresolution to friends and adversaries, while denying the democratic resistance help that it so desperately needs. These amendments would prevent us from providing humanitarian assistance and exchanging information to sustain and preserve the democratic resistance. They would effectively remove the resistance as a source of pressure for dialog and internal reconciliation. If those struggling for democracy are not supported, or worse, forced to become refugees, the Sandinistas will be encouraged to press their military advantage and the prospects for a peaceful resolution will be diminished.

I take very seriously your concern about human rights. The U.S. condemns, in the strongest possible terms, atrocities by either side. We are committed to helping the democratic resistance in applying strict rules regarding proper treatment of prisoners and the civilian population. And we urge their leaders to investigate allegations of past human rights abuses and take appropriate actions to prevent future abuses.

I recognize the importance that you and others attach to bilateral talks between the United States and Nicaragua. It is possible that in the proper circumstances, such discussions could help promote the internal reconciliation called for by Contadora and endorsed by many Latin American leaders. Therefore, I intend to instruct our special Ambassador to consult with the governments of Central America, the Contadora countries, other democratic governments, and the unified Nicaraguan opposition as to how and when the United States could resume useful direct talks with Nicaragua. However, such talks cannot be a substitute for a church-mediated dialog between the contending factions and the achievement of a workable Contadora agreement. Therefore, I will have our representative meet again with representatives of Nicaragua only when I determine that such a meeting would be helpful in promoting these ends.

Experience has shown that a policy of support for democracy, economic opportunity, and security will best serve the people Central America and the national interests of the United States. If we show consistency of purpose, if we are firm in our conviction, we can help the democratic center prevail over tyrants of the left or the right. But if we abandon democracy in Nicaragua, if we tolerate the consolidation of a surrogate state in Central America responsive to Cuba and the Soviet Union, we will see the progress that has been achieved in neighboring countries begin to unravel under the strain of continuing conflict, attempts at subversion, and loss of confidence in our support.

There can be a more democratic, more prosperous, and more peaceful Central America. I will continue to devote my energies toward that end, but I also need the support of the Congress. I hope the House will support your legislation.

Sincerely,

RONALD REAGAN.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, the preceding speaker Mr. McCURDY and I had a chance to visit El Salvador in February 1982. At that time there had only been one other Republican down there in about 8 years and only 1 Democrat, the former

chairman of one of the appropriations subcommittees, Doc Long.

I had taken my sons down alternately and then in February 1982 I took my wife to try and show Congressmen and women that it was not Dodge City in the 1800's down there, but that El Salvador is a beautiful country and that there was much for all Americans to learn about in a country we were trying to help.

I remember the gentleman from Oklahoma saying to Beth Nissen of Newsweek Magazine during a dinner at the American Ambassador's home that he did not like to use the word "Communist," because it was pejorative. And I recall vividly my wife then asking the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. McCurdy) if he chose not to ever use the word "Communist," then what did he call Communists? The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. McCurdy) had no answer. Well, that antipathy about calling Communists "Communists" has certainly been retired in this continuing debate over aiding the Contra-tyrants.

Now we have in this House total recognition, there are truly Communists in Nicaragua. But I am confused by our President's letter to Mr. McCurdy. The President in speeches across the country in the last few days proclaimed that he would never again use the term Sandinistas but instead say Communists. But not in his letter to McCurdy. Back to Sandinistas. Why? And then the letter says that he only wants to apply "pressure" with a "viable and democratic resistance."

Well, I ask my President and ask everybody who plans to participate in that hot debate coming up tomorrow: What is this pressure? Are we encouraging young Nicaraguans to shed their blood as we encouraged young Vietnamese, Cambodians and Laotians to do, just for a little pressure?

LBJ told the world in the sixties, "We're only applying pressure, pressure to get the Communists to the negotiating table. Fifty eight thousand of our finest young men and nine young women died to apply a little pressure. After we walked away the dieing continued in 1973 and 1974 and 1975, until our allied countries fell to communism? And the dying goes on to this day.

I do not know what is wrong with a military solution in Nicaragua if our military is not involved. What's wrong with a victory over communism. The Communists in Nicaragua are there to stay unless driven to Cuba by freedom fighters repeating the revolution for freedom that deposed Samozza.

If the OAS would withdraw recognition of the betrayers—the government in Managua—the result would be swift. If Costa Rica, Honduras and El Salvador withdraw recognition, then Guatemala, then the United States.

The heat is on. And Nicaraguans smell victory over oppression. And then freedom begins to win.

THE SITUATION IN CENTRAL AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to speak before the American Security Council on the subject of U.S. policy in Central America.

In view of the deliberations now underway in the House with regard to aid to Nicaragua, I would like to place the text of my speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to stress my belief that this is no trivial issue, but rather a pivotal issue with regard to the security of the United States. ●

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE SAMUEL S. STRATTON AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL

THE SITUATION IN CENTRAL AMERICA

In the years of the Reagan Administration there have been two areas, from a national security viewpoint, where there have been sharp partisan policy differences: defense and Latin America.

The differences in defense have, of course, been debated at great length, not only on the floor of Congress, but also in the media; and as Congressman Les Aspin, the new Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, said recently in a speech, the Democrats, with some significant exceptions, are clearly viewed as strongly against defense.

With even fewer exceptions the same split prevails, with respect to Latin America. The Administration is deeply concerned with the rapidly growing dependence of Nicaragua on the Soviet Union as it affects the security of the United States.

The crux of these policy differences has centered around our dealings with the so-called Contras, the rebel military forces who oppose the Marxist-Leninist coloration of the Sandinistas, most recently highlighted by the hurried trip that President Ortega took to Moscow the very day after Congress refused to provide even "humanitarian" assistance to the Contra forces.

Republicans had opposed humanitarian aid, since it would have had little impact in getting the Sandinistas to clean up their political act. Democrats figured that since the Congress lacked the votes to give the Contras military aid, why waste \$14 million on a group they never really liked anyway.

But the Ortega hegira to Moscow produced some red Democratic faces and new efforts are now underway to come up with at least a slightly tougher approach to the Sandinistas.

Outside of Congress it is my impression that only a few people are really concerned with Nicaragua. The ones we hear from mostly oppose the President's stand.

Not too many people have traveled to Latin America and, except for Mexico, the beaches are not nearly as inviting as are those in Bermuda, the Bahamas, or the Virgin Islands. The feeling seems to be that the major problem is poverty not communism. To be sure, there is plenty of poverty in Central America, as there is, incidentally,

also in South America, once you get out of the center of the cities and get a look at the favelas and the tar-paper shacks where the majority of people lives.

But it is easy to overlook the fact that it is precisely in poverty areas where communism has flourished best. And America, as we did in El Salvador, and as we have done in countless other areas of the world, has never hesitated to spend money to relieve poverty—from the Marshall Plan in Post-war Europe to the famine relief in Ethiopia.

But what is facing us today is a serious potential military threat to the United States. Nicaragua has become a major Soviet outpost on the continent of the Western Hemisphere, in contradiction to the Monroe Doctrine.

To be sure, Cuba is also a Soviet satellite in the Caribbean and also poses a military threat to us with their air bases, their combat battalion, their nuclear-capable Mig 23's, and the ballistic missiles that can be fired from their submarine base at Cienfuegos, to say nothing of their continued supply of Cuban soldiers to Soviet trouble spots in Angola and Ethiopia.

Nicaragua already has a modern airport in Managua, but a few miles away they have been gradually developing an even bigger military airport which could handle the nuclear-capable Mig 23's as well as the long-range Soviet Bear, and even Backfire bombers.

And Cuba, after all, is just an island. But Nicaragua is part of the continent. A Soviet foothold in Nicaragua could provide the basis for a Soviet move north, taking over not only El Salvador, which they have been trying desperately to do, but have not accomplished in face of the brilliant and courageous leadership of José Napoleon Duarte.

Some have urged us to negotiate with Nicaragua. Secretary Shultz carried out such negotiations for months—but with no results. Much like what apparently seems to be going on in Geneva with the Russians: lots of talk but no results.

It is possible we might tolerate a Marxist government in Nicaragua, even one that has flagrantly abandoned all its promises. But we cannot tolerate the export of communist revolution in the Caribbean.

The classic proof of what is underway in the Soviet plans in Latin America was Grenada.

Grenada was a small island—but it has become a microcosm of what the Soviets and their communist bloc countries are up to in our back yard.

Six warehouses full of all kinds of weapons from Libya, Czechoslovakia, Red China, Bulgaria, and the Soviet Union. Six million rounds of ammo and thousands of those AK47 rifles that got Admiral Metcalf into so much trouble along with some soldiers and Marines. Obviously, such an enormous weapons cache was not intended for the 100,000 citizens of Grenada. They were destined for distribution throughout the Caribbean.

The documents in Grenada we picked up spelled out very precisely how the Soviets planned to integrate these islands in America's back yard. People pooh-poohed when President Reagan showed the Grenada airport on TV and called it a military threat. But it would have been a military threat, without our prompt intervention.

Some people have worried that Nicaragua could become another Viet Nam. Quite the contrary. In Viet Nam our American soldiers were fighting to help the Vietnamese.

But the Soviets used no troops in Viet Nam. Instead, in Viet Nam as in Korea they used surrogates to fight their battles. Today in Nicaragua we already have the trained, determined, courageous, freedom fighters who are not only willing but eager to fight our battle to put an end to this military threat.

We have no desire to take over Nicaragua. We just refuse to permit another Cuba in Central America. Diplomatic talks have done no good. The Contra forces are the only genuine leverage we have on our side to convince the Nicaraguan government to reform its ways and to clean up its act.

Some would suggest that we turn the whole issue to a handfull of Latin American States, the Contadora group. But they, too, have come up empty-handed in getting the Sandinistas to back off their efforts to take over other states. Moreover, as the major power in the area, we can hardly leave the determination of our major security interests to other outside groups.

But most of all we need to convince the American people that these surrogate fighters, these Nicaraguan Freedom Fighters, cannot carry on the job they are prepared to perform without weapons, without ammunition, without the funds just to be able to subsist in their courageous undertaking without money and without the gratitude and the recognition of the American people.

After all, it is virtually an open secret that we have been supporting the brave, courageous Afghanistan Freedom Fighters over three or four years. No one shudders about that. Why is it heroic to support the Freedom Fighters of Afghanistan—fighting against Soviet combat troops—but somehow is dirty, immoral, and infradig for us to give any military assistance whatever when these brave men are also seeking, in concert with what is supposed to be the leader of the free world, to restore in Nicaragua the freedom and democracy they long for.

This is no Caribbean adventure. This is an attempt to recognize a threat for what it is and to respond to it in time. This is what the debate in Congress in the next few days is all about. We don't need to use American troops. We have surrogates to carry our battle. But we must make sure the American people understand, as they don't seem to understand today, what is up and what the stakes really are.

That's what the American Security Council is for and what it does so well in raising these vital questions that some many of our lawmakers would seem to want to brush off—to keep this country of ours filled in on the progress of American security in every portion of the world, to bring the most essential facts, and thus to keep America free, safe, and secure.●

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL IS A BUDGET BUSTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, some time within the next few weeks most of the American people are probably going to hear from their Member of Congress who is going to send them a newsletter or do a press release or make a speech or say something about all the fighting of the deficit that is going on in Washington.

I hope the American people will keep in mind the supplemental appropriation bill whenever they hear that Member of Congress so representing himself as a deficit fighter because the bill that we have had on the floor the last couple of days, particularly today, is a perfect example of why this country is in great financial problems and what this Congress does to contribute to them.

This bill was brought to the floor under a rule that mandated \$3 billion of budget busting. The rule not only protected a lot of budget busting, but it also flatly allowed us to consider a bill that violated the budget.

So Members of Congress who voted for that rule did so knowing that what they were doing was busting the budget.

□ 1820

So the bill came to the floor under a situation that we knew the budget was going to be busted, and we have continued, through a series of amendments here on the floor to assure that we were going to bust that budget.

We, for instance, today rejected an amendment that was aimed at trying to reduce the spending in this bill by \$500 million of foreign aid to one country.

Now that country already—Egypt—gets \$2.2 billion; and so we are going to give a \$500 million bonus.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado suggested that maybe we did not want to do that, since that is all of the taxes of 143,000 American families, maybe we did not want to spend all of the taxes of 143,000 families to give Egypt a \$500 million bonus.

This House rejected that idea. This House decided to go ahead, spend the budget-busting money; go ahead and spend the bucks. Remember that when someone tells you that they are serious about fighting the deficit.

Then we had another amendment, that I offered, aimed at saying "OK, if we don't want to reduce it in the foreign aid area, maybe what we ought to do is reduce spending" where we have add-on spending around this body. Thirty million dollars' worth of add-on spending that we are doing right here in the Congress.

Maybe we ought to try to put our own house in order and save millions upon millions of dollars by cutting some spending around here. The House rejected that idea. The House said, "Go ahead and spend the money. We don't want to save money when it comes to our own pocket."

In fact, when another amendment was offered that was aimed at doing just one thing about ending abuse around here, just one thing, and that was ending abuse of the frank, the procedure by which we have free mail around here, we could not even get enough Members of Congress to stand

and have a vote on that matter, because nobody wanted to go on record as saying that they were willing to spend \$12 million for add-on spending for the franking privilege for Congress, the free mailing privilege; \$12 million simply to add on to our mailing costs around here, but we could not get enough Members to stand to get a vote.

It is obvious why; as I say, no one wanted to be recorded on that kind of a vote; they do not want to face their constituents and explain why they, the great deficit fighters, are willing to spend fantastic amounts of money for add-on spending for free mail for Congressmen.

Finally, we had an amendment aimed at just cutting 5 percent across the board. We do not have the guts to face up to the specific spending items, maybe what we ought to do is just try in a general way to cut across the board; but again, it was rejected because the fact is that we are a spending body.

The arguments made against the 5 percent across the board went through a whole series of proposals all of which are meritorious programs and gee, we cannot cut those.

The fact is that we cannot cut spending in this body. This is a serious bill that we have had before us. It is a serious bill because this is when we really get down to the business of deciding whether we are going to spend the money.

Most of the rest of what we do around here is fluff. The Budget Act is fluff because the fact is we are going to violate the budget anyhow; we are proving it with this bill. Most of the authorization process around here is fluff because it does not really spend money. It is when you really get down to this kind of bill, the supplemental appropriations we have had before us, that you really spend the money.

Well, Congress is showing that is precisely what it intends to do; it intends to spend the money. It intends to spend the money even if it has to violate the Budget Act, even if it is spending money to feather our own nests, even if it is spending money where a 5-percent cut can easily be made; Congress decides "No. No; we don't want to cut. We want to spend the money."

The American people want to know why we have deficits; the American people have to look no further than this House, they have to look no further than the votes on that supplemental bill. Each and every Member of Congress has had his chance to do something about deficits, and all too sadly the majority Members of Congress have decided they want to talk about cutting deficits, they do not want to do anything about it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

THE CHALLENGE OF YOUTH SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article by Franklin Thomas, president of the Ford Foundation, which recently appeared in the New York Times.

Mr. Thomas calls attention to the tragedy of continuing youth unemployment and points to the innovative efforts of a number of States and localities in using the energies of these young people to provide needed community services as an example for a larger program of national service.

I share Mr. Thomas' interest in a program of voluntary national service and in fact, I have introduced legislation in this Congress to encourage and expand these local and State efforts. My bill, H.R. 888, the Voluntary National Youth Service Act, would provide Federal matching funds to youth service or conservation programs like the ones described by Mr. Thomas. These programs provide an opportunity for young people not only to better themselves but to also better their local communities by providing needed social services. Through local service, youth service participants become productive members of society. I urge my colleagues to lend their support to these efforts. The text of Franklin Thomas' article follows:

NATIONAL SERVICE FOR JOBLESS YOUTH (By Franklin Thomas)

Despite the economic recovery, the labor market seems to have shut down for young people. While it is estimated that five to six million parttime jobs will become available this summer, this number falls far short of demand and will have only a limited impact on the mounting yearround jobless rate for youth.

While total national unemployment hovers near 7.2 percent, youth joblessness stands at 16 percent for whites, 24 percent for Hispanics, 43 percent for blacks. The reasons for this failure to absorb young workers are familiar: industrial and technological changes generate fewer entry-level jobs; manufacturing has fled the inner city for suburbs and now, increasingly, for other shores; many youngsters are not adequately taught workplace skills and attitudes.

This summer, before more teenagers are abandoned to the ranks of the unemployed, let us renew the idea of national youth service. Proponents of such a program share the conviction that young people represent a vastly underused resource that should be encouraged to offer itself in the service of our society, economy and national defense. They believe a system of youth service might help dampen the incidence among youth of drug and alcohol abuse, crime and vandalism, unwanted pregnancies and other symptoms of alienation. Most important, national service could be more than a repair shop for social damage or a means of keeping youngsters occupied: it could help them sort out their identities, build lifetime prin-

ciples and develop a greater respect for self and society.

Congress last year passed a bill that would have created an American Conservation Corps to put youngsters to work in parks and public lands. President Reagan vetoed that bill. The strongest leadership on behalf of youth service, however, has come from states and municipalities. Consider these examples:

The New York City Volunteer Corps. Many participants in this city-funded organization are high school dropouts. Members earn \$80 a week staffing a shelter for the homeless, rehabilitating city parks and taking oral histories from residents of a geriatric center. Those completing the 12-month program are awarded cash and educational vouchers to provide free schooling.

The California Conservation Corps. Assignments for this \$35 million a year program funded by California's Natural Resources Department range from repairing dams to clearing salmon streams to assisting forest-fire brigades.

The Northwest Youth Corps. This summer-only environmental program in Eugene, Ore., has a unique feature: roving crews of young workers are hired directly by private businesses for short-term assignments. The logging industry has used the corps to assist in replanting forests after timber harvests.

In all, more than 30 such programs are taking shape around the country. While some, such as Pennsylvania's year-old Conservation Corps, are targeted at the economically disadvantaged, others, like the California corps recruit members from a wide spectrum of social and educational backgrounds. One notable effort, in the East Harlem section of New York City—the Youth Action Project—specifically seeks society's most difficult youngsters and helps them devise their own community service programs.

Not only do these programs help develop values and attitudes that go with responsible adulthood, studies show that work experience—even part-time jobs—together with education and skill training can significantly improve a young person's long-term employment and earnings prospects.

The Federal Government should study the successful examples of local youth service programs to design a national program. Clearly, a number of concerns would have to be considered: for example, program design, the extra costs imposed on a deficit-burdened budget, the impact on military recruitment, rural vs. urban settings, attitudes of organized labor, etc.

Despite such problems, national service is a compelling idea that merits trying. The important point is making the commitment before youth unemployment rates get even worse.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, on June 6, 1985, I was absent for two votes. Had I been present I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall No. 145: "yes."

Rollcall No. 146: "no."●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I was obliged for personal reasons to be in my district on June 6 and to miss five rollcall votes. If I had been present to vote, I would have voted to approve the journal and I would have recorded my presence at the time of the quorum call. On consideration of H.R. 2577, supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1985, I would have voted for the rule, for the Edgar amendment to the Whitten amendment, and for the Whitten amendment as modified by the Edgar amendment.●

NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER FOR PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this special order in support of a National Day of Prayer for Peace in the Middle East.

As we meet here on behalf of peace in that troubled part of the world, Catholic, Jewish, Moslem, and Protestant clergy, and lay people are convening at an interdenominational prayer service at the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception here in Washington in search of the spiritual solution to end hostilities in the Middle East. I am pleased that some of my colleagues have taken the time from their busy schedules to join me to offer their support for this peaceful endeavor.

The last 37 years have been characterized by violence and bloodshed as we searched for solutions to the problems in the Middle East. Our normal political and secular efforts toward peace in that area have yet to achieve the results those nations so desperately seek. It is heartening that people of all faiths, religions, and political beliefs are able to set aside their differences and join together in a National Day of Prayer for Peace in the Middle East.

Involved as we all are in seeking viable solutions to this conflict, we often lose sight of our common goal—not the victory of one nation over another, but the victory of peace over violence.

Peace can be achieved when the people of all religions and all points of view sit down and talk in an atmosphere of mutual respect and common resolve to reach a fair, just, and lasting settlement of their differences. Perhaps the National Day of Prayer for Peace in the Middle East—supported by religious, governmental, and community leaders—can be a first step toward a just and lasting peace that

recognizes the hopes, aspirations, and security of the peoples of the Middle East.

□ 1830

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE].

Mr. LEVINE of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I wish to commend my distinguished colleague from Ohio for having called this special order on this extremely important subject. The gentleman from Ohio has been one of the leaders in this House, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and as a member of the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East, in terms of seeking viable solutions to move toward peace in the Middle East.

As the gentleman and as all of our colleagues know, this has been an area of the world which has been wracked with division and conflict, with a great deal of trouble and difficulty for generations. And the fact that we do today celebrate a national day of prayer directed toward peace in the Middle East, and that this is a day of prayer which includes people of all faiths, people from the three great religions who have been seeking and searching for a peaceful solution in this world, is a matter of some significance.

So I am very pleased that the gentleman from Ohio has asked me to share this special order with him, to compliment and to congratulate the religious leaders and the lay leaders from the three great religions, Christianity, Mohammedanism, and Judaism, all of which have a deep and significant stake in achieving a just and lasting long-term peace in this region. I commend, as does the gentleman from Ohio, these leaders who have come together in prayer seeking the type of solution for which all of us yearn and for which all of us dedicate so many days and hours in our deliberations here in a legislative context. It is appropriate that there be a spiritual context which ultimately will be absolutely essential in terms of ensuring that type of tranquillity, that type of peace, that type of solution for which we all seek.

So I commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] and I commend the persons throughout the world and particularly those who are here today in Washington seeking peace through prayer and through a spiritual foundation.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE] for his comments this afternoon, and I think they are reflective of the very caring, the very thoughtful, the very responsible positions that he has taken in his efforts in the Congress to try to bring about a lasting peace in a very troubled region of the world.

● Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to applaud the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] for bringing this ecumenical effort to the House's attention. The united action of religious leaders of several faiths on behalf of peace in the Middle East is representative of the efforts we should be promoting in the region.

Peace cannot be achieved by unilateral action. When the various forces in the Middle East can sit around a negotiating table as mandated by the agreements at Camp David and U.N. resolutions 242 and 338, then they will be on a path to resolving the conflicts that bring violence and disruption to the region.

The prayers of these rabbis, priests, and ministers serve to focus our attention on the ultimate goal of our work in this House. We work toward a day when all the people of the Middle East can live in peace and friendship. We have our work to do here. We thank our friends in this ecumenical task for lending us their prayers. ●

● Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, at 6 p.m. on June 11, 1985, there will be an interdenominational prayer service at the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception for Peace in the Middle East. This is a noble undertaking that deserves the support of peace-loving people everywhere. The last 37 years have been characterized by violence and bloodshed as a means of solving the problems in the Middle East. Our normal political and secular efforts toward peace in that area have not produced results. It is time that men of all religions, and all points of view, humble themselves together before God to ask His help and guidance. Peace can only be achieved when the leaders from all responsible factions sit down and talk in an atmosphere of mutual respect, and with the common resolve to reach a fair, just, and lasting settlement of their differences. Perhaps the National Day of Prayer for Peace in the Middle East is the first step in that process. Perhaps when men of different religions can pray together in a common liturgy for a common goal, they then can learn to sit together and talk together. May God soften the hearts of men everywhere, and may He guide them with His invisible hand toward peace. ●

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include therein extraneous material on the subject of my special order this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IN NICARAGUA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, although a recent New York Times poll shows that 62 percent of the American people support humanitarian aid to the Contras, there is still a lot of confusion and misunderstanding about United States foreign policy in Nicaragua. The growing public backing of the administration has been impeded by the lingering fallout from Vietnam, the determined reluctance of this body to take the lead in protecting the natural rights of our neighbors and, perhaps most importantly, the tendency of administration proponents to assume that the American people have an intimate knowledge of recent history and current events in Nicaragua.

These three factors, among others, have combined until now to render American common sense susceptible to the perhaps well-intentioned, but false, arguments which have made us hesitant to do what is right.

I am hopeful that tomorrow this body will act wisely and adopt the bipartisan McCurdy-McDade amendment. As for the remaining misgivings about U.S. policy, I would like to offer some plain talk.

In the country and in the Congress, when people know the truth, there is strong support for the freedom fighters in Nicaragua. But this body has been particularly reluctant to show leadership, and as a result, we have yet to reach a consensus. Yes, almost everyone has now lined up to criticize the Sandinista regime, and to recognize the fact that they are Marxist dictators and terrorists in Nicaragua, but that is all.

We have been talkers, not doers; politicians, not statesmen.

Those of us who have supported administration policy have become extremely frustrated, but perhaps it is our own fault.

Perhaps we have been misguided or naive in assuming that repeated recitation of Sandinista totalitarian policy would spur our colleagues into action. Time and again we have documented that the Sandinista regime is anti-Semitic, antiunion, antireligion antifree press, and antiminority. We have noted their massive military buildup, their reliance on numerous Soviet and Cuban advisers, and their adoption of police-state social structures, such as neighborhood-informer groups and the turbas, or divine mobs, who attack political dissent and free expression.

And each time, our pleas have fallen on deaf ears. Although every Member of this body embraces the democratic principles that the Sandinistas reject, the majority of this House have lacked

the will to act in defense of those principles.

Make no mistake, this is a dangerous course. For a retreat in the face of a threat to the natural, and as our Constitution calls them, "inalienable," rights of one people is, in essence, a greater threat to the rights of all.

How have we come to this state of affairs in the United States—the Nation that was once the world's greatest champion of freedom? We have come to such a state because of Vietnam. Regardless of where one stands on that issue, the Vietnam War was a most severe trauma for our Nation. It still colors everything we do—or don't do—in the realm of U.S. foreign policy.

I believe that as a country we have grossly overreacted to that war. We have gone far beyond the point of prudently drawing lessons from adverse experiences, to a point in which we have stuck our heads in the sand and withdrawn into a shell, in an attempt to avoid all potentially disturbing influence.

As to Nicaragua, this post-Vietnam mindset has literally paralyzed us. In the presence of a dictatorial regime which openly espouses the spread of Marxist revolution throughout the hemisphere—and our hemisphere, not some land halfway around the globe—the post-Vietnam mindset has completely disabled us and kept us from doing even the bare minimum.

And it is a bare minimum that will be at issue tomorrow. The McCurdy-McDade amendment provides only humanitarian aid. It is not as strong as I would have liked, but it is a reasonable compromise which provides assistance to the right people and does not encourage Nicaraguans to become refugees, as the Hamilton amendment does.

Not even the freedom-seeking people of Nicaragua can blame us for suffering through the national post-traumatic neurosis that is the legacy of Vietnam. The war was that serious a trauma.

But that war is over. It is time to rise above that pain. And it is time for us to move forward on behalf of those weaker than ourselves, those who cannot move forward without us, those who will be literally crushed by our inaction.

History teaches us that those people will be crushed without our help, for as in so many cases of current events, we have been here before.

Our children may understand this lesson of history better than we do. In a textbook used in many American high schools and colleges, "A History of the Modern World," Prof. R.R. Palmer of Princeton University and Prof. Joel Colton of Duke University say this about the causes of World War II:

105: The Weakness of the Democracies:

Again to war.

The Pacifism and Disunity of the West.

While dictators stormed, the Western Democracies were swayed by a profound pacifism, which may be defined as a somewhat doctrinaire insistence on peace regardless of consequences. Many people now believed, especially in England and the United States, that the First World War had been a mistake, that little or nothing had been gained by it . . . that vigorous peoples like the Germans or Italians needed room for expansion, that democracy was after all not suited to all nations, that it took two sides to make a quarrel, and that there need be no war if one side resolutely refused to be provoked—a whole system of pacific and tolerant ideas in which there was perhaps the usual mixture of truth and misunderstanding.

The United States Government, despite President Roosevelt's repeated denunciation of the aggressors, followed in practice a policy of rigid isolation. Neutrality legislation (was) enacted by a strong isolationist bloc in Congress. . . . From this American neutrality legislation the aggressors of the 1930's were to derive a great benefit, but not the victims of their aggression.

Adolf Hitler perceived these weaknesses with uncanny genius. Determined to wreck the whole treaty system, he employed tactics of gradual encroachment which played on the hopes and fears of the Democratic peoples. He inspired in them alternating tremors of apprehension and sighs of relief. He would rage and rant, arouse the fear of war, take just a little, declare that it was all he wanted, let the former allies hope that he was now satisfied and that peace was secure; then rage again, take a little more, and proceed through the same cycle.

That was a rather long quotation, Mr. Speaker, but it shows clearly the disturbing parallels between yesterday and today in terms of our children, if not we, can understand—and it suggests the grave risk history predicts for us if we persist in our isolationism.

Our parents were paralyzed by World War I; we are transfixed on Vietnam. The Congress of the 1930's ignored F.D.R.'s warnings; this Congress blocks President Reagan at every turn. The Axis powers consumed whole nations and peoples; the Soviet bloc grows into Cuba, Nicaragua, Grenada (temporarily), and licks across the borders of Costa Rica, Honduras, and El Salvador. Our parents waited so late to act that the cost was enormous once they did; we run that same risk today.

Mr. Speaker, let's put all our cards on the table for the American people to see. What has happened in Nicaragua is this: Anastasio Somoza was a repressive dictator in Nicaragua for many years, and we made a mistake in supporting him. To rectify that mistake, we provided millions of dollars in aid to the group known as the Sandinistas, who in 1979 succeeded in overthrowing Somoza, taking control of the government themselves.

The Sandinistas were Nicaraguans of differing ideologies and backgrounds. We knew that many of them—particu-

larly the political and military leaders who held the most power—were devoted Communists, that is, believers in the elimination of private property and the establishment of a totalitarian system of government in which a single authoritarian party controls state-owned industry and labor and, ultimately, all political expression. But still we hoped that these members of the Sandinista revolution would follow through with their promises of reform, and would eventually give way to the others in the movement who truly believed in democracy and an open society. So we gave them money in the belief that our assistance and encouragement would make our hopes come true. We chose to believe the Sandinista voices which said they planned to create a new, free Nicaragua. We chose to believe that the Sandinistas would replace Somoza's authoritarian rule with a new democracy.

We made a mistake, Mr. Speaker. The Communist leaders have taken full control of Nicaragua and have betrayed the revolution. They betrayed our good faith and our trust. And in doing so, they have fired the first shot in what has become the new battle for the freedom of the Nicaraguan people and the rest of Central America. That's really what this whole battle amounts to.

The freedom fighters, also known as the Contras, are in large part the same people who fought the Somoza dictatorship originally. They are ex-Sandinistas who have broken from their former colleagues as those colleagues have made crystal clear that there was never any real plan to establish freedom in Nicaragua. From the first day of the new regime, the Communist Sandinistas—the real muscle of the revolution—have moved to build economic and military ties to the Soviets and Cubans, to build by far the largest military force in Central America, and to support Communist insurgencies in other neighboring Central American countries.

The Sandinista betrayal has also been manifested in their refusal of our offer of Peace Corps assistance, their refusal of our offer of \$5 million to aid their private sector, their expulsion of the Salvation Army from the country, their refusal to accept a cease-fire and negotiate with the freedom fighters under church supervision, and their most recent obstruction of the Contadora peace process, when they reneged on an agreement in principle to allow international observers into Nicaragua to monitor the demilitarization of Central America.

So, Mr. Speaker, these are the various parties and elements involved, and that is what they stand for. The American people are beginning to focus on these facts more every day. That is

why a majority of them now support the U.S. trade embargo and humanitarian aid to the Contras. We must follow their lead in this House. We must pass McCurdy-McDade when it is considered tomorrow.

Let us not muddy the waters with our colleagues' arguments that the United States is trying to overthrow the Sandinista regime, or that the United States is interfering in the internal affairs of a sovereign nation.

We all know, and the American people know, that there is no real prospect that this aid will overthrow the Sandinistas. What we are interested in, in reality, is mere pressure on the Sandinistas to negotiate in good faith—the stick of “carrot-and-stick” diplomacy.

Documents captured in April from Salvadoran guerrillas show that this approach—and only this approach—is effective in ending the hostilities. Specifically, they showed that Sandinista military support for the Communist Salvadoran guerrillas was temporarily cut way back after the Grenada rescue mission, for the Sandinistas feared that their continued export of revolution in the form of military aid to the guerrillas could provoke a firm response by the United States.

Similarly, my colleagues, we are not interfering in the affairs of a sovereign state by passing McCurdy-McDade. That word, “interfering,” should not be the bogeyman that it has been. The Sandinistas took power at the barrel of a gun and then turned that gun on the people of Nicaragua and on the true democrats who helped them gain power. The subsequent presidential election of 1984 was a sham that cannot disguise the illegitimacy of the regime.

Bayardo Arce, one of the nine ruling Sandinista strongmen, has been recorded on tape saying that the Sandinistas never intended—never intended—to have real elections or a democratic society. He called the elections “a nuisance” and referred to the new Nicaraguan Constitution this way: “We are using an instrument claimed by the bourgeoisie, which disarms the international bourgeoisie, in order to move ahead in matters that for us are strategic.” In other words, Mr. Speaker, they have utter contempt for constitutional democracy but will sing its praises and fake its implementation to buy time and fool the world.

The documented Sandinista export of revolution also totally negates this “interfering” ploy. Once a party expands its reach beyond its borders—and captured documents, backed by defector Napoleon Romero's May 12 statements, show clearly that's what we are dealing with here—all bets are off, and we enter the realm not of interference, but of self-defense.

And since the aid that we will vote on tomorrow is not even military in

nature, surely it is preposterous to argue that we are exceeding the bounds of proportionate self-defense. If the Sandinistas can give the Salvadoran guerrillas 70 percent of their total arms, which those guerrillas then use to kidnap and murder Salvadoran mayors, surely we can give food and bandages to the Sandinistas' democratic opposition.

What we propose to do is legally and morally right. We are merely aiding others in their own fight. In doing so, we avoid war, and we avoid repeating the mistakes of our parents before World War II. The United Nations Charter, the Charter of the Organization of American States, and the Rio Treaty on which we joined with our neighbors, all of these recognize the right, if not the duty, to respond proportionally to aggression, collectively or individually. Take a look at article 51 of the U.N. Charter, articles 22, 27, and 28 of the OAS Charter, and article 3 of the Rio Treaty.

It is also no excuse to say, Mr. Speaker, that our assistance is immoral simply because Nicaragua is not under actual invasion by another power, as is the case in Afghanistan and Cambodia where many of your colleagues support covert military aid to freedom fighters. Wasn't it moral for us to materially oppose the Quisling Regime in Norway and the Vichy Regime in France, which ruled in World War II at the behest of the Nazis without the fulltime presence of a Nazi invading force?

Of course it was moral, and the “no invasion” theory wears especially thin when we remember that today, the modern style of totalitarian expansion comes equally in the form of guerrilla wars and undeclared wars of so-called national liberation.

Mr. Speaker, let's return bipartisanship to U.S. foreign policy, and let's tell Daniel Ortega where he can get off with his return trip to Moscow right after this House voted to cut off aid last time. The President was right on El Salvador—even the Washington Post agrees our policy has helped create a democracy in that country—and I believe he is right on Nicaragua.

Speaker O'Neill has fought us all the way, but El Salvador's progress shows we were right there. I hope he will join us tomorrow and support McCurdy-McDade humanitarian aid to those who are giving their lives for freedom in Nicaragua.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1840

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. First of all, I want to thank the gentleman for putting some of the situation in Nicaragua into historical perspective. I think he does the House a great service and he does the

country a great service in giving us this kind of a background.

The gentleman remembers, as I do, when we were fighting the Vietnam war and there was much dissension about the battle in this country; that many of the folks who are today on this floor telling us that we should not carry on any kind of action against the Communists in Nicaragua. They were telling us at that time that if the Vietnam war were being waged in Central America, it would be a different equation. One of the arguments that was used all the time in the debates that I participated in during that era was that that was thousands of miles away, and that it had no bearing on us; we were not fighting any kind of a battle that would in any way impact on us. If this was something that was taking place in Central America, then we should worry. But we ought not worry since it was in Southeast Asia.

Now, today, having had the Vietnam experience and having had us back out of Vietnam, they now come back when we are faced with a situation in Central America and say we ought not repeat Vietnam in Central America. In other words, having had us retreat in Southeast Asia, they would now say that the lesson of that is that we should retreat in Central America.

I just wonder if the gentleman recalls, as I do, that in the historic context which he raised here with us that the left was saying totally different things at that time that they now tell us on Central America.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It seems that the left will reach for an argument to keep us out of that God-bidden war no matter where they go and no matter what type of aggression or oppression they are looking at.

The gentleman is absolutely right. They reach for arguments saying, “Of course we would get involved in Central America, but we do not have to get on the other side of the world during Vietnam.”

□ 1850

They also did basically the same thing prior to World War II and said that is for the Europeans to determine on their own; we do not have to get involved. Of course, we withheld because of their arguments.

Now they are saying, as the gentleman has pointed out, “No, we should not get involved in Central America. We should leave the Central Americans to their own self-determination.” Read into that the fact that if we had done that in El Salvador 5 or 6 years ago, El Salvador would be a Marxist regime today, just like Nicaragua is. We got involved and we helped those people economically, not necessarily militarily. We gave them some military supplies. But they pulled themselves up by their bootstraps and they

are succeeding, as the Washington Post indicates, as a viable democracy today for the first time in their history.

But more importantly, again, some of these same people who are saying we should not get involved in Central America have no hesitation about getting the United States involved in the Middle East, or no hesitation about sending great amounts of money to Turkey to defend its borders against the Soviets. I happen to agree with that policy, but many of these same people would vote to support Turkey or they might even vote to support Afghanistan, which is fighting a freedom fighter war over there, way on the other side of the world. Yet they have blinders on. They just do not see the need to get involved in Nicaragua, which, of course, is on our continent, only 1,200 miles of my home, New Orleans, closer actually to my home in New Orleans than my home is to New York City or to Los Angeles.

I just think that it is a very narrow minded approach that hopefully will never come back to haunt us, but I think the best way we can avoid what they are looking at and what they profess to fear, that being the great conflagration between the East and West, is if we just send a little bit of money down to those people who are actually Nicaraguan citizens who are seeking to defend freedom and pluralism and democracy in their own country and who want to bring and branch out this very totalitarian government that exists there today.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield further, there is another sense of *deja vu* that I found in the gentleman's remarks. The gentleman pointed out that the left is also attempting to undermine the credibility of the Contras and to build up the Sandinistas, and so on, the same thing that was done in Vietnam. If we want to learn a lesson from Vietnam, we can remember the people marching in the streets shouting, "Ho, Ho, Ho Chi Minh, We Are Going To Help You Win," and being on the side of the Communist government, but every little detail of the South Vietnamese, every little scandal, every little problem, was highlighted as a major problem because, after all, we were giving aid to South Vietnam.

We find the same thing now in Nicaragua. While they say, give a boilerplate, to "Well, I do not like the Sandinista government either," the fact is that all the arguments are in defense of the Communists in Nicaragua and all of their arguments about the people who are doing bad things are against the Contras. So it is our allies that they constantly argue against.

As I say, if we want to learn lessons from Vietnam, there is a sense of *deja vu* with what we are hearing about Nicaragua today.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The gentleman's point is well taken. They continuously ignore the atrocities that are perpetrated by the Communist government in Nicaragua, the imprisonment, the executions, the tortures, the oppression of religion, and basically the suppression of all freedoms across the board, and try to dredge up evidence against the freedom fighters in Nicaragua. I notice they went so far as to come forth with a couple of pictures of alleged killings at the hands of the Contras a few days ago, but the Washington Times published a picture showing that the guy who had come forward with those pictures was not only not to be trusted, but that he was totally incredible.

So that argument was shot down, but still and all, they concentrate their efforts of antagonism against the people who really want to restore freedom in Nicaragua. It seems that it goes on time after time after time. When this issue is long behind us, we will probably have experienced an intensity of the undermining of the democracy in the Philippines, Southeast Asia will eventually come back to haunt us as the Communists try to move into those bastions around the world, and there is really no end to it, but I think the one great way that the American people could stand up and show that they are tired of this onslaught by the left to desecrate the principles of this great Nation, the United States of America, and to stop the onslaught is simply to support the Congress in their efforts to give the money that we are requesting to the freedom fighters so that they can carry on and do the job themselves to bring pluralism, and to bring back freedom to Nicaragua.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman would yield further, it is also interesting how the left is so quiet these days and El Salvador. The gentleman mentioned, I think very validly, that El Salvador is becoming a success story, so all of a sudden the left does not want to talk about that. Particularly what they do not want to talk about is death squad activity in El Salvador because the Government down there, with our support, has begun the process of cleaning that problem up insofar as Government-sponsored or quasi-Government sponsored death squad activity, and the death squads are all now operating from the left. It is the Communists who are pillaging throughout El Salvador, killing Government officials at the national level, at the local levels. Death squad activity, we still hear reports from the human rights groups about deaths that are taking place in El Salvador, but it is the left that is perpetrating them, so suddenly we do not want to have any discussion of the situation in El Salvador because it is, in fact, the Communists in Nicaragua who are

backing the Communists in El Salvador who are now engaged in massive violations of human rights through death squad activities.

We become very forgetful on the left in this country when those kinds of activities take place. As we say up in my country, the Pennsylvania Dutch country, 'tis passing strange.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for his comments. He is absolutely right. I think it is significant that really the only prominent mention of El Salvador in the press recently was to commend the Salvadoran Government that we supported, that we pulled up by the bootstraps, which has gone off on its own and immunized all of the children, whether they were in Communist stronghold areas sectors of El Salvador or not, immunized all the children against serious diseases.

So I think we can indeed prove and point to a success story in El Salvador. The only reason we can is because we did get involved both economically and with some military supplies, but without the involvement of U.S. troops, and those folks succeeded in bringing a democracy to the Salvadoran people. That is all we are trying to ask for in Nicaragua, and yet we are being opposed by the same folks who, for the last 6 years, have opposed us at every juncture with respect to El Salvador.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGRICH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for taking the time to bring this to the country's attention and the House's attention, and with his permission there are three passages in a recent book that I think are particularly relevant to the point the gentleman is making that there is a relationship between the failures of the past and stopping communism in other countries. The very same people and the very same ideology that was blind to communism in the past once again proving that its ostrich-like capabilities of remaining blind are true today.

The book I want to quote from is "Breaking With Moscow," by Arkady N. Shevchenko. Shevchenko is the highest ranking Soviet official ever to defect. He was the Under Secretary General of the United Nations. He had worked closely with Gromyko, and he wrote this book which has recently been on the best seller list. I think it makes three points that I think are well worth our considering as Americans. He says on the very last page, and I quote:

The U.S. sometimes lacks the steadiness to deal persuasively with the Soviets. Its

policy toward the Soviet Union seems to jump from extreme to extreme.

The point he is making here is, again, that the very people who were unsteady in Vietnam and were unsteady in El Salvador are unsteady in Nicaragua, and they cannot quite seem to bring themselves to try to stop the Soviet Union or its allies.

He goes on to say, I think this is very hard for Americans to accept in the world we live in, but we have here the word of the highest ranking Soviet ever to defect:

If American leaders do not forget an old and still true lesson, what the men in the Kremlin understand best is military and economic might, energetic political conviction, strength of will. If the West cannot confront the Soviets with equal determination, Moscow will continue to play the bully around the globe.

I think that is an important concept. Mr. LIVINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

□ 1900

BREAKING WITH MOSCOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I will not take all my time, but I want to go on and point out, to build on the case the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] was making, that when you look at the question, as Mr. Shevchenko suggested to us on page 370 of his book that we need to recognize the Soviets will react to energetic political conviction and strength of will, and you then listen to the debate from what I would call leftwing ostriches in the U.S. House of Representatives, it would be hard to imagine being further away from the values and the strengths and the determination and consistency that, in fact, one would expect if you were in the Kremlin asking, "What are the Americans going to do?" and if you listen to excuse after excuse and to the failure of the ostrich wing of the American society to learn any lessons about communism.

Let me make two other points. We on our side, I believe, would draw the argument that there are certain lessons of the dangers of communism that we should have learned from Cuba and from Fidel Castro, and Shevchenko reinforces these lessons.

When people say to me, "Why are you worried about Nicaragua? That is a tiny country," these are the same people who said earlier, "Why are you worried about Cuba? It is a tiny island."

Let me read two quotes from Shevchenko's memory of his experience of trying to deal with the Soviet Union in Cuba in the context of Cuba's role in

the world. He makes this point, for example—and I quote from page 143—"Gradually, however, the Kremlin became more sympathetic to Cuba's contention that Socialist revolution in Latin America should be accomplished by military rather than peaceful means."

Now, the meaning of this assertion is very simple, and I say this to all my friends on the left who keep on getting up and saying, "Look how much poverty there is. Look how much difficulty there is with people not having adequate food, adequate housing, and adequate education." The reality is that communism can be imposed by military force, that Castro is dedicated, just as Adolf Hitler was, to the supremacy of military force, and that the use of force to impose communism is a key characteristic of the Soviet Union, of Fidel Castro, of the Cuban Communists, and now of the Nicaraguan Communists.

Why, then, do we have to be vigilant? Why then do we have to worry?

Let me again quote from page 272, talking about the years of American weakness. Shevchenko was in Moscow when Vietnam was lost. He was in the Foreign Ministry watching the Soviet Union react to a Congress which had lost its way and had lost its will. He was there when the Soviets could not believe how ostrich-like the American left was in avoiding the realities of the Soviet system and of the dangers of communism in Southeast Asia.

This is what he said happened after the American Congress collapsed in its will to resist in Southeast Asia and after we sent signals of weakness. This is in talking with Kuznetsov, a senior Soviet leader:

"How did we persuade the Cubans to provide their contingent?" I asked Kuznetsov.

He laughed. After acknowledging that Castro might be playing his own game in sending about 20,000 troops to Angola, Kuznetsov told me that the idea for the large-scale military operation had originated in Havana, not Moscow. It was startling information. As I later discovered, it was also a virtual secret in the Soviet capital. Certainly, Western analysts had assumed that the Soviet Union, which had airlifted Cuban soldiers to Angola to help Neto defeat the Western and Chinese-supported factions of Savimbi and Roberto, had called on its Caribbean ally for what proved to be crucial assistance.

Why had the Cubans volunteered? First, they badly needed to boost revolutionary fervor at home. More and more Cubans had become disillusioned with Castro's regime and its chronic economic distress. Second, Castro still cherished the idea of himself as a great international figure. His early efforts to spread revolution in Latin America—the obsession of his firebrand comrade Che Guevara—had gone against more conservative Soviet advice to concentrate on first establishing a healthy domestic economy and on mending relations with his country's neighbors.

By 1975, however, Moscow was welcoming and encouraging Cuba's adventurism. Growing Soviet military strength prompted the

Kremlin to take a more decisive role in Africa's struggles than had been possible before.

Contrary to the current spirit of Soviet-American relations, the Politburo was determined to push ahead in Africa without taking American opinion into account. Cuban successes had convinced many in Moscow that the United States lacked will in Africa. After its humiliation in Vietnam in 1975, America was increasingly portrayed by party militants as a diminished rival in the Third World. Although some experts took a more cautious line, the Soviet leaders judged that in addition to the "Vietnam syndrome," the United States now had an "Angola syndrome."

Moreover, 1976 was a Presidential election year, a contributing factor in the timing of Soviet offensive actions. The prevailing view within the Foreign Ministry was that America was far more concerned about its internal politics than anything to do with Africa. "Once again the Yankees have handcuffed themselves for most of the year—they won't be looking at us," was a cheerful boast of confidence I heard from more than one Soviet official.

That is from page 272, "Breaking with Moscow," by Arkady Shevchenko, the highest ranking Soviet official ever to defect.

Now, my challenge to my ostrich friends on the left, people who are well-meaning and sincere but remarkably naive, is: How many defectors do you have to hear from? How many Soviet high officials do you have to learn from? How many occasions of American failure does there have to be?

If Vietnam was not successful in convincing you that the Soviets and their allies were not nice people, if the massacre of the Cambodian people did not convince you that the Communists were not nice people, if the fact that today there is a Vietnamese Army firing into Thailand does not convince you that, in fact, dominoes do fall, what about the experiences of Shevchenko himself? When a Soviet high official tells you flatly that Castro is the enemy of America, that Cuba was systematically seeking ways to militarily expand communism, not to exploit poverty, not to worry about human rights, not to deal with difficulties in Central America, but to systematically use military force in Latin America and Africa, at what point then do you have to recognize that maybe Mr. Shevchenko is correct in saying "The United States sometimes lacks the steadiness needed to deal persuasively with the Soviets?"

What I am saying tonight and what I have said in recent days and will say again in the future is very uncomfortable for some of our ostrich friends to learn. The very nature of ostriches makes them wish to deny reality, and when it is brought to their attention again and again, they find it painful.

Let me quote again from the last page of Shevchenko's book, because it is the key to why I hope that people will look to Grenada this fall and why

we will take the week of October 26 and use it as a week not only to celebrate the liberation of Grenada but to study Leninism.

Shevchenko said this:

Plain truth is the most effective weapon against the falsehoods on which the Soviet system is built, the myths about itself it has been all too successful in spreading around the world. Truth is also the one force that can dispel the secrecy behind which the Soviet leaders hide the reality of their system and their intentions.

That is on page 370, in his epilogue as he closed his book.

Now, what is the plain truth? The plain truth is that the Nicaraguan Government is a Communist government, that the Nicaraguan Government is systematically allied to Cuba and the Soviet Union, and that the Nicaraguan Communists are already waging war against Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador. The three guerrilla armies in each of those countries are headquartered in Nicaragua, and we know they get training in Cuba and they get Soviet military equipment by way of Cuba to Nicaragua and then on to their neighbors. We know that the leaders of the Nicaraguan Government are not only Communists but they are proud to call themselves Marxist-Leninists.

Listen to what Shevchenko says of Leninism:

... in effect a new religion has emerged in the U.S.S.R., a religion that flourishes as did the old Orthodox faith in times past. The new religion, of course, is Leninism.

Shevchenko goes on to quote the Washington Post of September 3, 1984, from an article by Richard Harwood, in which Harwood says:

It is a religion sustained by a profound faith in a beneficent Father, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin. As Christ (is) to Christians, as Muhammad (is) to Moslems, Lenin to this society is a holy prophet and guide, not divine perhaps, but more than mortal. To believe otherwise—to dissent from Leninist orthodoxy—is the new heresy.

□ 1910

Now, what are Shevchenko and Harwood telling us? They are telling us that to be a Leninist is to believe in a system of values that is fairly clear cut, fairly decisive and around which a semireligious cult is built.

And what does Leninism say? It says, first, that it is the nature of the Soviet state and Leninist followers to be at war with America and the West.

It says, second, that as long as there is freedom in the West, there can be no true peace because we are by definition a threat to the survival of the Soviet dictatorship.

It says, third, that they are endowed with the moral right and duty to lie to Americans.

In fact, ironically, Lenin called the leading Soviet newspaper, Pravda, which means truth and when asked how he would explain that one time,

he said, "You must remember, I am the editor of truth. I, therefore, am in charge of truth and truth is by definition what I write."

In that setting, it is amazing to me that Ortega, the dictator of Nicaragua, a Communist leader, a self-proclaimed Marxist-Leninist, when he decided to go to Moscow after the last time this House defeated aid for the freedom fighters seemed to shock some of our more ostrich-like Members. They could not quite believe that a Communist Nicaraguan who had been to Moscow on several occasions would be so arrogant as to rush back to Moscow as soon as we defeated aid to the freedom fighters.

One said to me in the hall that he could at least have waited a week, a sign which I thought indicated the length of time it takes an ostrich to bury its head in the sand again, since apparently had he gone after the week was up, the ostriches would not have noticed, but by leaving too early, the ostriches could not avoid seeing the Communist go back to Moscow.

The question I would ask of our ostrich-like friends as they prepare to vote tomorrow is simply this. If tomorrow night you defeat aid to the freedom fighters, if tomorrow night you succeed in handicapping your own country by imposing on it rules which the Soviet KGB will not follow, rules which the Cuban secret police will not follow, rules which no terrorist will follow; by crippling only America tomorrow night, if you pass the Boland amendment, by weakening only America, what then will you do on Thursday morning if Ortega visits Moscow again or if Borge, the head of the secret police, decides to visit his friend Qadhafi in Libya, what then will you say? Will you be shocked again?

How often do you really expect the American people to believe the ostrich-like plea that you did not know, you did not realize, you did not understand?

The fact is quite simple. The Nicaraguan Communist Government is the enemy of the United States. The Nicaraguan Communist Government is an ally of the Soviet Union and of Castro's Cuba. The Nicaraguan Communist government is already waging a war against its neighbors. The Nicaraguan Communist government is building a 12,000-foot runway for an airfield a meter thick, strong enough to carry Soviet bombers, an airfield which makes sense only if Nicaragua is an ally of the Soviet Union.

Tomorrow, we will have a chance in this House to vote either to help the freedom fighters fight for their own lives in Central America or to strangle freedom by cutting them off.

Tomorrow we will have a chance in this House to vote to at least allow the American side to have as much strength in Central America as the

Communist side, or as some of our ostrich friends would have us, we will vote to cripple the Americans, while the Communists are uninhibited.

This may well be the most important vote since Democratic President Harry Truman came to this Congress in 1947 and outlined the nature of communism and asked for our help in order to stop communism in Greece and Turkey.

It is my hope that every Member of this House will have looked at the Grenada documents and lessons they teach before voting.

It is my hope that every Member of this House will have looked at the book, "Breaking With Moscow" by Shevchenko before voting.

To not look at the Grenada documents, which are published by our State Department, to not have any idea of the lessons we have learned about communism from documents we captured in liberating that island, to not study Shevchenko's work, to not appreciate the scale of the threat to this country and to still vote to cripple American forces first, to cripple America's allies first, would in my judgment be an act of such amazing irresponsibility, of such blindness to communism, that it is hard to imagine any Member could willfully act in ignorance.

So I hope in the next few hours that every Member who is considering voting for the Boland amendment will look first at the historical record of the Grenada documents, of the personal testimony of the highest ranking Soviet official ever to defect, and then will look second at the nature of the American people.

There was one unfortunate letter sent out last week by a Member of this House, who I will not name because he is not on the floor and I have not had time to invite him to be here, but in which he claimed the American people were against our policy in Nicaragua.

I have sent a "Dear Colleague" letter containing far more accurate information from public opinion polls which proves rather conclusively that the American people on the big issues do in fact have a pretty good sense and are in fact on the side of freedom. Fifty-nine percent of the American people believe that the Soviet Union cares about global domination, not just national security. That is almost 6 out of every 10 Americans has a clear sense that the Soviet Union is in fact interested in dominating the whole world, not just protecting its borders.

Eighty-three percent of the American people believe that the Soviet Union is either a severe or moderate threat to the survival of the United States and to American interests. That is 8 out of every 10 people.

Eighty percent of the American people are aware that Cuba is Commu-

nist and a very high percentage believe that Cuba is a real threat to its neighbors.

Not as many Americans as yet know about Nicaragua, but I would say to my ostrich friends, do not deceive yourselves. Over the next year or two as the country comes to understand that Nicaragua is Communist, as the country comes to understand that Nicaragua is allied with Castro and that Nicaragua and the Communists are allied with the Soviet Union, the same general principles will apply to the country's beliefs.

When informed that Nicaragua is Communist, a clear plurality, 49 percent of the American people, based only on that additional information, were willing to support American activities on behalf of the freedom fighters.

I suggest to our friends who in an ostrich-like way have been neglecting or ignoring the lessons and dangers of communism that before you vote, you should look at the historical record of the Grenada documents, the personal testimony of Mr. Shevchenko, and finally, you should look back to your own constituents. You should go home and ask them, because I think you will find they are truly concerned about a 12,000-foot Soviet runway within easy distance of the Panama Canal, about another Communist dictatorship in a country, Nicaragua, which is closer to Miami than Miami is to Washington, DC, and about the notion that American Representatives would be willing to cripple the American Central Intelligence Agency when the Soviet KGB is unhindered, would be willing to cripple the American forces in helping freedom fighters when the Cuban Communists would be unhindered, would be willing to cripple America's efforts to defend freedom, when the Soviet effort to expand slavery would be unhindered.

In that setting, I suggest that tomorrow's vote may well be one of the most decisive in American history.

So, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FEIGHAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. STRATTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SPRATT, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, today.
Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, June 12.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, June 12.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, June 13.

Mr. FRANK, for 60 minutes, June 18.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DELAY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, today.
Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, June 12.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, June 13.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. WALKER, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. AU COIN, immediately after the remarks of Mr. DICKS on H.R. 2577, in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. LIVINGSTON, on the strategic petroleum reserve on H.R. 2577 in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, immediately after the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] on H.R. 2577, with respect to Customs, in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. SILJANDER, following Mr. DAVIS and prior to acceptance of amendment by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] in the Committee of the Whole today on H.R. 2577.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DELAY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COMBEST.
Mr. MYERS of Indiana.
Mr. RINALDO.
Mr. CONTE in two instances.
Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
Mr. BEREUTER.
Mr. MACK.
Mr. GOODLING.
Mr. GINGRICH in five instances.
Mr. LAGOMARSINO.
Mr. MONSON.
Mr. SILJANDER.
Mr. BOEHLERT.
Mr. CHAPPIE.
Mr. COBLE.
Mr. CRANE.
Mr. COURTER.
Mr. BROYHILL.
Mr. GROTEBERG.
Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FEIGHAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RANGEL in two instances.
Mr. MONTGOMERY.
Mr. FLORIO.
Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.
Mr. LIPINSKI.
Mr. KASTENMEIER.
Mrs. BURTON of California in two instances.
Mr. YATRON.
Mr. TORRICELLI in three instances.

Mr. SCHUMER.
Mr. PANETTA.
Mr. STARK.
Mr. MURPHY.
Mr. SOLARZ in two instances.
Mr. RODINO.
Mr. FASCELL in two instances.
Mr. VENTO.
Mr. MOAKLEY.
Mr. STUDDS in three instances.
Mr. BEDELL.
Mr. COELHO in two instances.
Mr. ANTHONY in three instances.
Mr. HOWARD.
Mr. MARKEY in two instances.
Mr. STRATTON.
Mr. WAXMAN.
Mr. HERTEL of Michigan.
Mr. LEVINE of California.
Mr. DELLUMS.
Mr. TRAXLER.
Mr. PEPPER.
Mr. OBERSTAR.
Mr. DASCHLE in five instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 12, 1985, at 10 a.m.).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1454. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 139(b) of title 10, United States Code, to exempt the Secretary of Defense from the contact award report requirement in two additional instances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1455. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting the fiscal year 1984 annual report, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1945, chapter 341, section 9(a) (88 Stat. 2336); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1456. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a semiannual report on the activities of the Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1457. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General for Administration, transmitting notice that the Department of Justice will modify the Privacy Act systems, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1458. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Administration and Resources Management, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting notice of the deletion of a system of records, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1459. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General for Administration, transmitting notice of five new systems of records, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

ant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1460. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on an altered system of records, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1461. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report on implementation of the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982, pursuant to Public Law 97-451, section 302(a); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1462. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a list of geological surveys conducted outside the national domain, pursuant to Public Law 87-626, section 2 (88 Stat. 1971); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1463. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting a report on the significant actions of the Office of Personnel Management (OPM), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1209(b); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1464. A letter from the Special Counsel, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the findings and conclusions of the Secretary of Transportation's investigation into allegations of improprieties by an attorney employed by the Federal Aviation Administration, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1206(b)(5)(A) (92 Stat. 1125); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1465. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report on the Urban Mass Transportation Administration for the first quarter of 1985, pursuant to Public Law 88-365, section 4(h)(1) (92 Stat. 2738); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1466. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), Department of the Army, transmitting a report on Lumber River Basin, North Carolina and South Carolina; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1467. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on Department of Defense Procurement from small and other business firms for October 1984 through February 1985, pursuant to SBA, section 10(d); to the Committee on Small Business.

1468. A letter from the Acting U.S. Trade Representative, transmitting a comprehensive study of foreign industrial targeting and remedies for such targeting on the automobile and computer industries, pursuant to Public Law 98-573, section 625 (98 Stat. 3042); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1469. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation called Foster Care Amendments of 1985; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. BURTON of California: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 195. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 99, a bill to provide for conservation, rehabilitation, and improvement of natural and cul-

tural resources located on public or Indian lands, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 99-166). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HALL of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 196. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 1409, a bill to authorize certain construction at military installations for fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 99-167). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1650. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act; with an amendment (Rept. No. 99-168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. NICHOLS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 2397. A bill to limit the payment of costs to defense contractors; with amendments (Rept. No. 99-169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON A REPORTED BILL

Under clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

The Committee on Foreign Affairs discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1452; H.R. 1452 referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ST GERMAIN (for himself, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. FRANK, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MANTON, and Mr. DRIER of California):

H.R. 2707. A bill to authorize certain interstate acquisitions of depository institutions; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LELAND, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HAYES, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. WILSON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. PORTER, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, and Mr. HANSEN):

H.R. 2708. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 with respect to the movement of coal over public lands, and for other purposes; Jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. ANTHONY:

H.R. 2709. A bill to provide for two additional members of the Prospective Payment Assessment Commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPIN:

H.R. 2710. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to strengthen the position of Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and reform the operation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 2711. A bill to amend title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve

the availability of student assistance for part-time students; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. RINALDO):

H.R. 2712. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require pension plans to allow participation by employees nearing normal retirement age and to allow benefit accrual by participants to continue past normal retirement age, and to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to extend its application to employees who have attained age 70; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOUCHER (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. BERMAN):

H.R. 2713. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to modify certain provisions pertaining to restitution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 2714. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to require State agencies to carry out a workfare program applicable to households participating in the Food Stamp Program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DASCHLE:

H.R. 2715. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide price support for the 1986 through 1993 crops of wheat and feed grains; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota:

H.R. 2716. A bill to amend titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to issue the Secretary's final decision, after certain hearings required thereunder, within 90 days after commencing proceedings before the Appeals Council in the Department of Health and Human Services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYMALLY:

H.R. 2717. A bill to establish an independent jury system for the Superior Court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EDGAR:

H.R. 2718. A bill to extend for 5 years the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to transfer dairy products to the Secretary of the Army for the use of Armed Forces and to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for use in Veterans' Administration hospitals; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ENGLISH:

H.R. 2719. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to devote certain farmland to conservation uses; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 2720. A bill to amend the Social Services Block Grant Act, to authorize consolidation of certain block grants to Indian tribes, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GARCIA:

H.R. 2721. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to require the collection of statistics on domestic apparel and textile industries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GARCIA:

H.R. 2722. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement relating to decennial censuses of drainage;

to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JACOBS (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COATS, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HILER, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. SHARP, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. STARK, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 2723. A bill to permit free entry into the United States of the personal effects, equipment, and other related articles of foreign participants, officials, and other accredited members of delegations involved in the games of the Tenth Pan American Games to be held in Indianapolis, IN, in 1987; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (for himself and Mr. MOORHEAD):

H.R. 2724. A bill to provide that filing and miscellaneous fees for the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia shall be collected in the same manner as such fees are collected for the other district courts in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (for himself, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. NELSON of Florida, and Mr. WALKER):

H.R. 2725. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, and the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, with respect to the use of inventions in outer space; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Science and Technology.

By Mr. LENT:

H.R. 2726. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a study on crime in domestic and international commercial shipping, and the impact of such illegal activity on the commercial shipping industry and consumers; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary, Public Works and Transportation, Energy and Commerce, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 2727. A bill to authorize the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital in southwest Florida; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 2728. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for an additional district judge for the central district of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONSON (for himself, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, and Mr. HANSEN):

H.R. 2729. A bill to modify the restrictions on the use of a certain tract of land in the State of Utah, and to provide for the conveyance of the fence located on such tract to the Armory Board, State of Utah; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut:

H.R. 2730. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act with respect to consumer leases and rental purchase agreements; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. OLIN:

H.R. 2731. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide for dairy production stabilization; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PARRIS:

H.R. 2732. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to prohibit the sale of real property in one State to any agency or instrumentality of another State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself, and Mr. JEFFORDS):

H.R. 2733. A bill to establish a supplemental higher education loan program in which a borrower's annual repayment obligation is dependent upon both postsecondary income level and borrowing history, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHARDSON (for himself, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. DOWDY, of Mississippi, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. RAPLH M. HALL, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SHELBY, and Mr. WHITTAKER):

H.R. 2734. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 to facilitate the transition of the natural gas industry to a more competitive market, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself, Mr. FISH, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. FEIGHAN, and Mr. SMITH of Florida):

H.R. 2735. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by modifying the notification requirements applicable to mergers and tender offers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAUKE (for himself, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, and Mr. BEDELL):

H.R. 2736. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to increase the number of United States bankruptcy judges authorized to be appointed for the northern district of Iowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANTHONY (for himself, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. REID, and Mr. DASCHLE):

H.J. Res. 311. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of October 15, 1985, as "National Poetry Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COUGHLIN:

H.J. Res. 312. Joint resolution designating August 13, 1985, as "National Neighborhood Crime Watch Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GINGRICH (for himself, and Mr. SKELTON):

H.J. Res. 313. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning October 30, 1985, as "The Lessons of Grenada Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H. Res. 197. Resolution authorizing printing of the transcript of proceedings of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs incident to presentation of a portrait of the Honorable Morris K. Udall; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

154. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the legislature of the State of Maryland, relative to change in the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

155. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Delaware, relative to economic welfare in Delaware; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mrs. BURTON of California introduced a bill (H.R. 2737) for the relief of Demetrios Theodoropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2: Mr. MOODY, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. RUDD, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. WHITEHURST.

H.R. 21: Mr. CONTE, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. McGRATH, and Mr. PURSELL.

H.R. 75: Mr. VALENTINE and Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 76: Mr. VALENTINE and Mr. SHUMWAY.

H.R. 97: Mr. CRAIG.

H.R. 276: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 370: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H.R. 382: Mr. COURTER, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. MAVEROULES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. REID, Mr. WISE, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. TAUKE, and Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 442: Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 469: Mr. COMBEST.

H.R. 528: Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 598: Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. LELAND, Mr. FRANK, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. HOYER, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 704: Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. WALKER, Mr. DENNY SMITH, and Mr. DARDEN.

H.R. 760: Mr. YATES, Mr. BEILSON, Mrs. BOXER, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 847: Mr. CHANDLER, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. EMERSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. SWINDALL.

H.R. 880: Mr. EDGAR.

H.R. 891: Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 1031: Mr. BATES.

H.R. 1032: Mr. BATES.

H.R. 1207: Mr. DASCHLE.

H.R. 1246: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. CONTE, Mr. STRANG, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BATES, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. ZSCHAU, Mr. MATSUI, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.R. 1284: Mr. MOODY, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. TORRES, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. SHARP.

H.R. 1294: Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 1309: Mr. SEIBERLING and Mr. EDGAR.

H.R. 1345: Mr. VALENTINE and Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 1357: Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 1375: Mr. ROE, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, and Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 1376: Mr. KINDNESS.

H.R. 1400: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. DYMALLY.

H.R. 1458: Mr. FEIGHAN.

H.R. 1467: Mr. STOKES.
 H.R. 1482: Mr. MATSUI.
 H.R. 1616: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. McCLOSKEY, and Mr. MINETA.
 H.R. 1666: Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. BROWN of California.
 H.R. 1722: Mr. HOYER.
 H.R. 1770: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. MARTINEZ.
 H.R. 1796: Mr. MITCHELL.
 H.R. 1905: Mr. YATRON and Mr. SAVAGE.
 H.R. 1910: Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii.
 H.R. 1940: Mr. FROST, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. MINETA.
 H.R. 1985: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. YATES, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. MCKINNEY.
 H.R. 2024: Mr. SCHEUER.
 H.R. 2078: Mr. RINALDO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mr. DARDEN.
 H.R. 2116: Mr. KOLTER.
 H.R. 2119: Mr. JEFFORDS and Mr. SOLARZ.
 H.R. 2137: Mr. JACOBS.
 H.R. 2162: Mr. DeWINE.
 H.R. 2226: Mr. BRUCE, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, and Mr. McEWEN.
 H.R. 2262: Mr. DURBIN.
 H.R. 2277: Mr. BEDELL and Mr. THOMAS of Georgia.
 H.R. 2326: Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. LEATH of Texas.
 H.R. 2346: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, and Mrs. LLOYD.
 H.R. 2364: Mr. MORRISON of Washington and Ms. OAKAR.
 H.R. 2383: Mr. RICHARDSON and Mr. WOLFE.
 H.R. 2397: Mr. DURBIN and Mr. MARTINEZ.
 H.R. 2401: Mr. ROYBAL and Mrs. LLOYD.
 H.R. 2406: Mr. SHELBY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. FAUNTROY.
 H.R. 2472: Mr. HOYER, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. STOKES, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. CARR, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. ROYBAL.
 H.R. 2495: Mrs. BENTLEY.
 H.R. 2508: Mr. VENTO.
 H.R. 2511: Mr. VENTO.
 H.R. 2512: Mr. VENTO.
 H.R. 2513: Mr. VENTO.
 H.R. 2524: Mr. MILLER of Washington.
 H.R. 2526: Mr. LEVINE of California and Mr. BROWN of California.
 H.R. 2567: Mr. OWENS, Mr. HAYES, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. De LUCA, Mr. LELAND, Mr. FRANK, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. WEISS.
 H.R. 2588: Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. MINETA, Mr. ROE, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii, Mr. FAUNTROY, and Mr. BLILEY.
 H.R. 2591: Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. GALLO, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, and Mr. FROST.
 H.R. 2597: Mr. DioGUARDI, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. GALLO, and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.
 H.R. 2684: Mr. HYDE.
 H.R. 2697: Mr. DARDEN, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MONTGOMERY, and Mr. BEVILL.
 H.J. Res. 41: Mr. LANTOS.
 H.J. Res. 144: Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MOODY, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. HOYER.
 H.J. Res. 145: Mr. STANGELAND.
 H.J. Res. 156: Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. O'BRIEN.
 H.J. Res. 178: Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. STARK.

H.J. Res. 221: Mr. BREAUX.
 H.J. Res. 222: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.
 H.J. Res. 224: Mr. LANTOS.
 H.J. Res. 250: Mrs. HOLT, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. De LA GARZA, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. LATTI.
 H.J. Res. 263: Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. GROTEBERG, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. McCOLLUM, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PRICE, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. MOORE, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. McDADE, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. DANNEMEYER, and Mr. FROST.
 H.J. Res. 287: Mr. AKAKA, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BOSCO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CARR, Mr. COATS, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DeWINE, Mr. DioGUARDI, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. DYSON, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HERTTEL of Michigan, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. IRELAND, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LATTI, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. McDADE, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. PRICE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REGULA, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SABO, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. WISE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. WYLIE, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.J. Res. 290: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. MINETA.
 H.J. Res. 293: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. APPELLEGGATE, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BARNES, Mr. BATES, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. BRYANT, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CARR, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COATS, Mr. COELHO, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DAUB, Mr. De LA GARZA, Mr. DeWINE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DioGUARDI, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. DYSON, Mr. EARLY, Mr. ECKERT of New York, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FROST, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HERTTEL of Michigan, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KEMP, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KOLTER,

Mr. KRAMER, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LATTI, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LENT, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. McDADE, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. MACK, Mr. MacKAY, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MICA, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. NEAL, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. PORTER, Mr. PRICE, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. QUILLLEN, RANGEL, Mr. REID, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SHARP, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SHELLEY, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. VENTO, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. YATES, Mr. YATRON, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. SABO, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. KASTENMEIER, and Ms. SNOWE.
 H.J. Res. 306: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. LAGOMARINO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. WEBER, and Mr. CONTE.
 H. Con. Res. 26: Mr. ROE and Mr. SCHUETTE.
 H. Con. Res. 69: Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. McCOLLUM, Mr. RAY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. TORRES, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. TRAXLER.
 H. Con. Res. 101: Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. KOLTER, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. BEDELL.
 H. Con. Res. 116: Mr. HAYES.
 H. Con. Res. 121: Mr. SOLARZ and Mr. FEIGHAN.
 H. Con. Res. 128: Mr. HYDE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. MOODY, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. FRANK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. DANNEMEYER, and Mr. NIELSON of Utah.
 H. Con. Res. 129: Mr. JONES of North Carolina and Mr. KOLBE.
 H. Res. 105: Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. ROTH, Ms. FIEDLER, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. FRANK, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. APPELLEGGATE, Mr. HENRY, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. VENTO, Mr. RINALDO, and Mr. LANTOS.
 H. Res. 152: Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. FRANK, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. CARR, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. MINETA.
 H. Res. 167: Mr. DeLAY, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WEBER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. SOLOMON.
 H. Res. 178: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. WHITEHURST.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

128. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Board of Supervisors, county of Los Angeles, CA, relative to C-17 airlift aircraft; to the Committee on Armed Services.

129. Also, petition of the city council of La Marque, TX, relative to the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

130. Also, petition of the city of New Braunfels, TX, relative to the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1555

By Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota:

—Page 154, after line 24, add the following new section:

SEC. 1208. REDUCTIONS IN AUTHORIZATIONS

Notwithstanding the amounts specified in the preceding provisions of this Act—

(1) the amount of each authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 1986 or fiscal year 1987 provided by this Act,

(2) the amount of the annual aggregate ceiling on foreign military sales credits pursuant to section 101(b) of this Act, and

(3) the amount of each earmarking of funds for specified international organizations and programs pursuant to section 402 of this Act,

shall be the lesser of (A) the amount specified in the relevant preceding provision of this Act, or (B) the amount which is 3.28 percent less than the amount specified for that purpose in the amendment-in-the-nature-of-substitute reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives to the bill H.R. 1555 (99th Congress).

—Page 131, after line 14, insert the following new section:

SEC. 910. SUPPORT FOR ADEQUATE FUNDING FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

It is the sense of the Congress that the programs carried out by the International Fund for Agricultural Development and the programs carried out pursuant to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 are valuable programs, and that those programs should receive adequate funding to carry out their purposes.

By Mr. DORNAN of California:

—Page 134, after line 18, insert the following new section 1103 and redesignate subsequent sections of title XI accordingly:

SEC. 1103. COUNTRIES LISTED AS COMMUNIST COUNTRIES.

Section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended by section 1102 of this Act, is further amended in paragraph (1) by inserting after "Mongolian People's Republic" the following: "Mozambique."

—Page 134, after line 18, insert the following new section 1103 and redesignate subsequent sections of title XI accordingly:

SEC. 1103. COUNTRIES LISTED AS COMMUNIST COUNTRIES.

Section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended by section 1102 of this Act, is further amended in paragraph (1) by inserting after "Mongolian People's Republic" the following: "Nicaragua."

—Page 125, after line 15, insert the following:

SEC. 810. REPEAL OF CLARK AMENDMENT.

Section 118 of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1980 (prohibiting assistance for military or paramilitary operations in Angola) is repealed.

—Page 134, after line 18, insert the following new section 1103 and redesignate subsequent sections of title XI accordingly:

SEC. 1103. COUNTRIES LISTED AS COMMUNIST COUNTRIES.

Section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended by section 1102 of this Act, is further amended in paragraph (1) by inserting after "Republic of Cuba" the following: "The Seychelles."

—Page 134, after line 18, insert the following new section 1103 and redesignate subsequent sections of title XI accordingly:

SEC. 1103. COUNTRIES LISTED AS COMMUNIST COUNTRIES.

Section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended by section 1102 of this Act, is further amended in paragraph (1) by inserting after "Mongolian People's Republic" the following: "People's Democratic Republic of Yemen."

—Page 134, after line 18, insert the following new section 1103 and redesignate subsequent sections of title XI accordingly:

SEC. 1103. COUNTRIES LISTED AS COMMUNIST COUNTRIES.

Section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended by section 1102 of this Act, is further amended in paragraph (1) by inserting after "Mongolian People's Republic" the following: "People's Democratic Republic of Afghanistan."

—Page 134, after line 18, insert the following new section 1103 and redesignate subsequent sections of title XI accordingly:

SEC. 1103. COUNTRIES LISTED AS COMMUNIST COUNTRIES.

Section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended by section 1102 of this Act, is further amended in paragraph (1) by inserting after "Mongolian People's Republic" the following: "People's Democratic Republic of Angola."

—Page 134, after line 18, insert the following new section 1103 and redesignate subsequent sections of title XI accordingly:

SEC. 1103. COUNTRIES LISTED AS COMMUNIST COUNTRIES.

Section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended by section 1102 of this Act, is further amended in paragraph (1) by inserting after "People's Republic of China" the following: "People's Republic of Kampuchea."

—Page 146, after line 4, insert the following:

SEC. 1112. REPEAL OF PROHIBITION ON ASSISTANCE FOR POLICE TRAINING.

Section 660 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is repealed.

—Page 134, after line 18, insert the following new section 1103 and redesignate subsequent sections of title XI accordingly:

SEC. 1103. COUNTRIES LISTED AS COMMUNIST COUNTRIES.

Section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended by section 1102 of this Act, is further amended in paragraph (1) by inserting after "Democratic People's Republic of Korea" the following: "Ethiopia."

By Mr. DURBIN:

—Page 61, beginning in line 14, strike out "Assistance under chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to the economic support fund)" and insert in lieu thereof "(a) CONDITIONS.—Assistance

described in subsections (b)(1) and (b)(2) of this section".

Page 61, line 18, strike out "amount of"; line 20, after "25 percent", insert "of the amount of economic assistance described in subsection (b)(1) and up to 25 percent of the aggregate amount of military assistance described in subsection (b)(2)"; and line 25, strike out "75 percent" and insert in lieu thereof "amount of assistance".

Page 62, line 6, strike out "amount of"; line 8, after "50 percent", insert "of the amount of economic assistance described in subsection (b)(1) and up to 50 percent of the aggregate amount of military assistance described in subsection (b)(2)"; and line 15, strike out "50 percent" and insert in lieu thereof "amount of assistance".

Page 62, after line 20, insert the following:

(b) ASSISTANCE SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS.—The conditions established by this section apply with respect to—

(1) assistance provided under chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to the economic support fund); and

(2) assistance provided under chapter 2 of part II of that Act (relating to grant military assistance), chapter 5 of part II of that Act (relating to international military education and training), and the Arms Export Control Act (relating to foreign military sales financing).

By Mr. LAGOMARSINO:

—Page 154, after line 24, insert the following new section:

SEC. 1208. DENIAL OF TRADE BENEFITS TO AFGHANISTAN.

(a) AMENDMENT TO TARIFF SCHEDULES.—The General Headnotes and Rules of Interpretation to the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) are amended by inserting "Afghanistan" before "Albania" in headnote 3(f).

(b) DENIAL OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS.—

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the products of Afghanistan shall not receive nondiscriminatory (most-favored-nation) trade treatment.

(2) No agreement may be entered into with Afghanistan under section 405 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2435).

(c) DENIAL OF TRADE CREDITS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Afghanistan may not participate, directly or indirectly, in any program under which the United States extends credit, credit guarantees, or investment guarantees.

—Page 145, strike out line 24 and all that follows through line 4 on page 146 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) EARMARKING OF FUNDS.—Each fiscal year, not less than \$15,000,000 of the aggregate amount of funds available to carry out chapter 1 of part I and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be available only for humanitarian assistance to the Afghan people pursuant to subsection (a) of this section.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATES.—This section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act, except that subsection (b) does not apply to fiscal year 1985.

By Mr. LOWERY of California:

—Page 125, after line 15, insert the following new section:

SEC. 810. FAILURE OF THE ETHIOPIAN GOVERNMENT TO EFFECTIVELY ANTICIPATE AND AMELIORATE FAMINE CONDITIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—
(1) many thousands of Ethiopian people have suffered and died, and an additional ten million people are in danger of death,

through starvation caused by prolonged drought;

(2) it has been suggested that the United States Government has been negligent in its efforts to ameliorate the tragic conditions present in Ethiopia;

(3) the Government of the United States has a continuing commitment to the emergency fund under title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (the Food For Peace Act);

(4) United States emergency food assistance for Africa in fiscal year 1985 is more than twice the amount provided in fiscal year 1984, and is the largest amount contributed by any single donor;

(5) the Ethiopian Government, as a client state of the Soviet Union, has considered the equipment and modernization of its five hundred thousand-person military organization more vital than alleviating the suffering of its people caused by drought;

(6) the Ethiopian Government has considered the funding of its military organization more vital than promoting a viable national agrarian policy;

(7) there is evidence that the Government of Ethiopia has used the drought-caused famine to induce cooperation from certain dedicated Ethiopians who seek to bring about fundamental changes in their country and to discriminate against certain other ethnic groups such as the Falashas or Ethiopian Jewish community;

(8) the United States Government is concerned about the seizure by the Ethiopian Government of an Australian aid ship in an attempt to cut off food to its citizens in the northern regions, an area most severely stricken by famine; and

(9) the Ethiopian Government deems the appearance and status of its socialist system more worthy of attention than its citizens and agricultural policies in need.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Government of Ethiopia should be condemned for its gross dereliction of responsibility and duty in failing to anticipate and ameliorate the severe drought and famine conditions throughout its agrarian countryside;

(2) the Government of Ethiopia should allocate more of its resources toward the development of a more balanced and effective agrarian system;

(3) human rights monitoring groups can be a positive force for human rights in Ethiopia and should be allowed to function and should be supported;

(4) the Government of Ethiopia should initiate a genuine policy of national reconciliation;

(5) the continued improvement of Ethiopia's treatment of the Ethiopian people and respect for human rights would better relations between the United States and Ethiopia;

(6) the President or his representatives should convey to Ethiopian officials the concerns of the Congress expressed in this section at every opportunity; and

(7) the President or his representatives should also convey these concerns of the Congress to the governments of United

States allies and urge the cooperation of those governments in efforts to ensure a more responsible Ethiopian Government.

By Mr. MILLER of Washington:

—Page 55, after line 17, insert the following new sections 408 and 409 and redesignate existing sections 408 and 409 as sections 410 and 411, respectively:

SEC. 408. COUNTRIES SUPPORTING INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 620A. PROHIBITION ON ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES SUPPORTING INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM.

"(a) PROHIBITION.—The United States shall not provide any assistance under this Act, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, the Peace Corps Act, or the Arms Export Control Act, to any country which the President determines—

"(1) grants sanctuary from prosecution to any individual or group which has committed an act of international terrorism, or

"(2) otherwise supports international terrorism.

"(b) PRESIDENTIAL WAIVER.—The President may waive the application of subsection (a) to a country if the President determines that national security or humanitarian reasons justify such waiver. The President shall publish each waiver in the Federal Register and, at least 15 days before the waiver takes effect, shall notify the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate of the waiver (including the justification for the waiver) in accordance with the procedures applicable to reprogramming notifications pursuant to section 634A of this Act.

"(c) INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION.—If sanctions are imposed on a country pursuant to subsection (a) because of its support for international terrorism, the President should call upon other countries to impose similar sanctions on that country."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3(f) of the Arms Export Control Act is amended by striking out "credits, and guaranties" and "credits, or guaranties" each place they appear.

SEC. 409. INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION BOYCOTT AGAINST IRAN AND LIBYA.

It is the sense of the Congress that the President—

(1) should call for an international civil aviation boycott with respect to Iran and Libya, and

(2) should take steps, both bilateral and multilateral, to achieve a total international civil aviation boycott with respect to those countries.

H.R. 1872

By Mr. ENGLISH:

—At the end of title V (page 68, after line 6) add the following new section:

SEC. 533. GRADE OF DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TASK FORCE ON DRUG ENFORCEMENT.

Section 525(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) An officer while serving as Director of the Department of Defense Task Force on Drug enforcement, if serving in the grade of lieutenant general or vice admiral, is in addition to the number authorized his armed force for that grade under paragraph (1) or (2)."

H.R. 2577

By Mr. DINGELL:

—Page 39, after line 18 insert:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

To the extent the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has authority or jurisdiction under the Federal Power Act of a Memorandum of Understanding for the California-Oregon Transmission Project, dated December 19, 1984 (50 FR 420, Jan. 3, 1985), as amended and supplemented by the Secretary of Energy prior to enactment of such paragraph, or of any contracts implementing such Memorandum, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission shall exercise such authority or jurisdiction within two years after enactment of this paragraph or after the filing of any such contract, whichever is later, and the Commission shall adjust its procedures and practices to ensure completion of such exercise of administrative authority or jurisdiction within such two-year period. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed by the Commission or any court as affecting, changing or limiting the authority, jurisdiction or procedures of the Commission under the Federal Power Act concerning rates, charges, service, facilities, classification, access or other matters in regard to such project. Consistent with the provisions of Public Law 98-360 which authorized the Secretary of Energy to construct or participate in the construction of such project for the benefit of electric consumers of the Pacific Northwest and California and obtain compensation from non-Federal participants in such project, sufficient capacity shall be reserved, as recognized in such Memorandum, to serve the needs of the Department of Energy Laboratories and wildlife refuges in California. The Secretary of Energy and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission shall keep the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate fully and currently informed concerning the project, any changes in such Memorandum of Understanding (as so amended and supplemented), the implementing contracts, compensation, reserved capacity for such laboratories or refuges, actions under the Federal Power Act, and any related matters. Nothing in this Act or in the Memorandum shall in anyway affect, modify, change, or expand the authorities or policies of the Bonneville Power Administration under existing law regarding wholesale power rates, transmission rates, or transmission access.